

[Mr. Speaker] [13th March 1953]

as the time within which nomination papers of candidates for election to the Board of Industries should reach the Secretary. Nomination forms can be had on application to the Secretary.

“ If the number of candidates nominated exceeds the number of seats to be filled, namely, one, a poll will be taken on a date to be announced in due course.”

### III.—DISCUSSION ON THE GOVERNOR'S ADDRESS—*cont.*

\* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to reply to the criticisms made about the scarcity and famine conditions prevailing in many districts of the State. Sir, famine is serious and extensive. It is not as though our land was not subject to famine; I heard the other day one hon. Member saying that in the days of Rama there was famine. Therefore famine is not a new feature. But the new feature now is it is extensive as well as continuous and acute and we will have to dive a little to find out the causes for it.

“ Sir, the Second World War upset the whole food position in the country and famine conditions have become acute as well as continuous thereafter. Soon after the Second World War, we had Independence and other difficulties. (Interruptions.) In the sense that Independence brought into existence a big Legislature of about 400 Members, each trying to ventilate his grievances and in some cases even ordinary deaths are taken to be starvation deaths. Sir, failure of monsoons has been continuous for about five or six years. So much so, scarcity conditions have been extensive, whereas previously they used to be centred in certain areas like Rayalaseema. Now, scarcity conditions are prevailing even in the fertile districts of Madurai, Tirunelveli, East Godavari, West Godavari, etc. Therefore, Sir, we are not able to tackle the problem as easily as we used to do in former days. Also, Sir, as I said some time back, the enlarged Legislature facilitated the ventilation of grievances by Members and it was not so in former days. In addition, the vernacular papers also highlight, if I may say so, and make the scarcity conditions appear as though there were starvation deaths galore. I do not deny that there are distress conditions. But what I want to say is that they are made to appear more serious than they are.

“ Sir, let me take this opportunity of telling the hon. Members how we have been able to meet the scarcity and distress conditions throughout the State. If hon. Members view it dispassionately without any bias, they will come to the conclusion that the Government have done what all is possible and that they have not shirked their responsibility. There were 4,078 relief works in operation employing on an average about 264,000 people a day. For the period from 1st October 1951 to 15th February 1953, the amount so far spent on relief works is Rs. 3,18,00,000 and odd. We have been running about 2,000 gruel centres. On account of better agricultural season this year, they have been reduced in areas where they could be reduced and we are now running about

13th March 1953] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

870 gruel centres feeding on an average about 368,000 persons and the cost thereon from 1st June 1951 to 15th February 1953 is about Rs. 88 lakhs. During the same period, loans for agricultural purposes were disbursed to the extent of nearly Rs. 2 crores (Rs. 1.96 crore and odd as on 15th February 1953). Subsistence loans were granted to the extent of about Rs. 77.0 lakhs, and about Rs. 29.0 lakhs for deepening wells and about Rs. 18.5 lakhs for pumping installations were spent. About 232 wells were deepened by the army to an average depth per well of 8 feet and their work was commendable because they did the work quickly with modern apparatus under difficult conditions. It was a bit costly but we did not mind it. The cost was about Rs. 6.5 lakhs. This work was mostly in Rayalaseema except for one or two districts in Tamil Nad. Kist collection also has been postponed in a number of districts. Proposals for remission of kist have come from many districts and remission has been ordered in certain districts and in other districts it will be soon ordered and the amount of remission will not be less than Rs. 75.0 lakhs.

“Sir, in addition to all these we had to deal with the very severe cyclone that visited Tanjore and Tiruchirappalli districts. In Tanjore district alone, for the rebuilding and repairing of houses and huts we spent about Rs. 14.25 lakhs. A compassionate allowance of Rs. 50 per family was given and a good amount was spent for the repairing of nets and catamarans. Three hundred and twenty-eight schools were fully or partially blown off and the amount granted for those schools was about Rs. 55,000. We have spent about Rs. 12,000 on loans to agriculturists for the distribution of seedlings. Remission of land revenue in that district alone will come to about Rs. 7,50,000. In addition, petty officers, viz., officers drawing a salary of less than Rs. 100 per month have been given three months' pay in advance. That has cost the Government Rs. 50,000.”

9-30  
a.m.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“But you are going to recover it later on.”

\* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“That is always there. But initially that has cost the Government Rs. 50,000. Next, Sir, for the construction of huts and small buildings which had been blown off by the cyclone, Government have had to spend about Rs. 2,00,000. Remission of revenue in the case of plantain and betel-vine plantations alone had cost the Government to the tune of about Rs. 1,50,000. Apart from all these, the Cyclone Relief Fund which was contributed by the public, got a total sum of Rs. 5,50,000. Out of this Tanjore got Rs. 4,80,000 whereas Tiruchirappalli got Rs. 48,000, the ratio between the two being 10:1 inasmuch as the damage in Tanjore was much greater than in Tiruchirappalli.



[Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker] [13th March 1953]

“ I will now give districtwar the amount we have spent on famine relief :

| District. |       | Amount spent on famine relief. |  |
|-----------|-------|--------------------------------|--|
|           |       | RS.                            |  |
| Anantapur | .. .. | 1,07,00,000                    |  |
| Cuddapah  | .. .. | 1,29,00,000                    |  |
| Chittoor  | .. .. | 1,35,00,000                    |  |

Let me now take two or three Tamil districts.

|                |       |                   |
|----------------|-------|-------------------|
| South Arcot    | .. .. | 13,00,000 and odd |
| Ramanathapuram | .. .. | 11,00,000         |
| Salem          | .. .. | 7,52,000          |

I am making this comparison of Tamil and Telugu districts because of the remarks of one hon. Member—I do not know the hon. Member nor do I know whether he is here now or not. I know only one thing and that is that the hon. Member represents the Markapur constituency. He complained that we have not taken proper care of Rayalaseema and other famine-affected Telugu districts. Let me tell this Hon. House that we have not made any distinction between either Telugu or Tamil districts. Our motto was: ‘Relief everywhere without distinction.’ In fact I being a Tamilian, took particular care to see that other people got more. That is why initially we spent so much on the famine in Rayalaseema. Later, trouble came in the south also. Cyclone broke out in the south. We have had trouble in Ramanathapuram and South Arcot due to failure of monsoon successively. Previously Rayalaseema was the focal point. All eyes were turned to the famine there. We spent all the money we had for famine relief in Rayalaseema. Later on we have had to adjust our expenditure because famine in acute form began to appear in other places. This is human psychology, Sir. When we have money jingling in our pockets we spend it lavishly. We go to shopping gaily and spend everything. Later on when our purse is lean, we feel that we could have been more economical. Therefore, Sir, it is quite obvious that no distinction whatever had been made by Government between Andhra and Tamil districts.

“ Now I shall turn my attention to the three districts that have been recently affected and which require immediate relief at the hands of Government. In this connexion I have to refer to the remarks of the Raja Saheb of Chettinad. He has said that the famine in Ramanathapuram is so extensive that there is no use of giving any relief in lakhs. He has estimated that if relief to the extent of Rs. 50 or Rs. 60 crores was given, then only things would be all right in Ramanathapuram. Well, Sir, the Raja Saheb is a person dealing in crores. We have got to think in lakhs and thousands only. (Laughter.) Unfortunately I became the Revenue Minister at a time when the finances of the State were dwindling and when even our reserves had been depleted to the extent of Rs. 35 crores. We are now living only from hand to

13th March 1953] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

mouth. So, if at all the Raja Sahib wants that the Government should spend in crores in Ramanathapuram, we have absolutely no objection if he were good enough to give us a loan of Rs. 1,00,00,000. (Laughter.) After all that is not a great amount for him. Apart from that he will get back the money with interest thereon." (Laughter.)

AN HON. MEMBER:—"You need not give the money back." (Laughter.)

\* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"The hon. Member, Mr. Anantha Pai, has urged in his speech the formation of a Famine Enquiry Committee which would enquire into all the problems connected with famine and suggest permanent remedies for the eradication of the famine menace. But let me tell the hon. Member that the Government of India have already constituted a similar committee. That committee has toured scarcity and famine areas and has, I think, submitted its report to the Centre and I think it is under their active consideration. We may know something about the results some time later."

AN HON. MEMBER:—"What about Tamil Nad?"

\* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Yes, yes. We do not neglect Tamil Nad. What is sauce for the goose is also sauce for the gander. What applies to Andhra applies equally well to Tamil Nad also."

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR:—"What about Malabar?" (Laughter.)

\* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, an hon. Member referred to water scarcity in Kadiri taluk. He even went to the extent of saying that people were migrating from the place due to this acute water shortage. Let me tell that hon. Member that Government are not overlooking the people's difficulties. Government have issued only three days before orders for the revival of the subsidy of Rs. 150 for deepening of wells. They have cancelled their previous order cancelling the grant of such subsidy. Therefore it is quite obvious, Sir, that we are doing our best to relieve the water scarcity."

"My hon. Friend from Ottapalam referred to the long-felt demand for some kind of reform in the tenancy system of Malabar. As I have already told the House the question of amending the Malabar Tenancy Act is under the active consideration of Government. A suitable legislation in that direction will shortly be introduced in the House. Then my friend also referred to the milling of rice. As far as I am personally concerned I entirely agree with him. It is true that too much milling of rice contributes to the washing out of the vitamins and as such the rice we eat now after it is polished once or twice contributes to 60 per cent of our present-day diseases. But Government cannot issue any specific order. Instead of hand-pounding which is by itself good, let people, if they want, at least take to eating boiled rice. It is



[Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker] [13th March 1953]

really good for health. I am told that vitamins are not lost if we eat boiled rice. That is why we see the poor people eating boiled rice strong, hale and healthy. It is only the rich who eat the double-polished rice that suffer from disease. Incidentally eating of boiled rice may also prevent starvation deaths. People may eat and live and not blame me.

"My picturesque friend from the Nilgiris referred to the picturesque Todas who number only about 400. The hon. Member pleaded eloquently for the Government giving them lands outright. Let me tell the hon. Member that even under the present conditions the Todas are given the lands outright. But the difficulty is that the Todas even though they are handsome and picturesque to look at, are not industrious. They are lazy. They do not cultivate the lands. They do not like any kind of work at all. They give their lands to the community to which the hon. Member belongs, viz., the Badagas, who in their turn cultivate the lands, take for themselves major part of the yield and give only a small part to the Todas. The Todas do not complain, because they are too lazy to work and are satisfied with what they get with no work at all. I am really surprised at the laziness of these Todas. Our statistics show and I hope that my colleague, the Health Minister, will agree with me when I say that the industrial workers multiply quickly each year. That is not the case with regard to the Todas. They may be 400 now. They may be 4,000 in a few years and multiply still more. If they are industrious, they can also be prosperous."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Then they can even send a representative and he can be here in this House."  
(Laughter.)

9-40  
a.m.

\* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"So, if they are real agriculturists, if they are industrious, I am quite sure they will become rich and they will produce more and their number will grow up to 4,000 and 40,000, and I am quite sure my friend will then be thoroughly satisfied. We can then have even a Toda representative in this House. What struck me was this: while the Toda male member is a tall and stalwart man, the Toda woman is short and is like a pigmy. I do not know how Nature can produce a male like that and a female like a pigmy. It is really a very curious thing.

"One hon. Member referred to the Governor's Address in these words: He made an allusion; I do not know whether he had heard it referred to by somebody or whether he had himself read Roman history, or he did not read it properly, or even if he read it, he did not use it in the proper sense at the proper juncture. He said that Nero was fiddling when Rome was burning. I submit, Sir, it is most uncharitable. What is the implication of that, I want to know. How does it apply here, I cannot understand. Where is Rome burning here and who is the Nero that is fiddling? What has the Governor done? He simply gave a resume of what has taken place and what will take place, and our

13th March 1953] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

friend here has thought it fit to characterize it as Nero fiddling when Rome was burning. I however take it that he used the words in a very light-hearted manner and so I leave it at that.

"The total amount spent by way of famine relief up to 15th February 1953, is Rs. 7.50 crores. We have since spent something more, and the total is likely to come up to Rs. 10 crores. We have spent these Rs. 10 crores without looking right or left; I do not know how the Finance Minister has found the money, but still we have actually spent the money. We have taken courage in both our hands and we have done all this. I do not think any previous Government have done such grand things as we have done. I now appeal to the hon. Members: there is no good going on criticising about men and things. My Friend, the hon. Member for North Madras, the other day vividly described a dead body, how crows were hovering round and pecking at the body and all that—all that picture he gave quite unnecessarily. It is all right to say such things when addressing an election meeting, because then you will have to rouse mass enthusiasm. But in an Assembly like this, we are all sober-minded people, we are all reasonable men. We must be prepared to submit to reason and not say things which will rouse feelings in anybody. It is very bad.

"As regards starvation deaths, the other day there was an interpellation in this House and somebody said people were dying of starvation. My Friend referred to the viscera and other things. I may tell him that I have gathered from a very reliable source and also from one or two hon. Members that that death was due to poisoning. It was said to be a case of datura poisoning; probably he had some trouble, some domestic trouble or even some love trouble. Have you not heard of suicide pacts nowadays? It is not that old men alone die or starving people alone die; even young people die nowadays as a result of these suicide pacts—not one person, but two at a time. There is a proverb in Tamil which people who are living amidst palmyra topes know. Palmyra fruit when it is tender is eaten and for that purpose it is gathered from the tree. But when it is left on to ripen, it falls down from the tree by pure efflux of time, i.e., when ripe. The crow sometimes perches on the tree and sometimes when the crow perches, the fruit falls down. The proverb is that when the crow perches on the tree the fruit falls down; but as a matter of fact, the falling down of the fruit has nothing to do with the crow perching on the tree; the fruit falls down of its own accord; it is just an accident that both the things synchronize. Similarly here, these deaths do occur almost everyday; and because we are in the midst of famine days, we are told that these are starvation deaths, and the whole blame is thrown on the Government. It is very uncharitable, as I said. Are we not all men of this country? Are we not all of us kith and kin? We do feel about these things as much as anyone else; then why do you want to paint these things as dark as possible and rouse the feelings of the people? Whatever you may do outside these walls, I appeal to you all not to make such speeches within this House.



[Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker] [13th March 1953]

"Yesterday in the Legislative Council, a handsome tribute was paid by the Hon. Chief Minister to the Members there for their restrained but trenchant criticism which one must naturally expect in a House of Representatives. Let us all try to emulate the Members of that House; we are all interested in doing good to the people; only, you take the short cut to the goal, while we take the right royal road; the short cut may be full of thorns while the high road, the tarred one, may be very long. It is not as if the short-cut is good, because if you fall on the thorns, you will have to take them out, then take rest, then there is delay and all that; so, why not take the royal road? It is the same thing here.

"Then, Sir, I must say in a general way, we have now attained Independence, and we have got a lot to do. We cannot afford to be indulging in bickerings and criticism. A piece of land may be obtained by assignment, but if you want to enjoy it, you will have to plough it with tractor or plough, you will have to bund it, then buy seeds, sow the seeds in the Japanese way or otherwise, guard over it and then reap the produce. Similarly here, we have just got the land—that is what I mean by attainment of Independence. Let us take the example of other countries. The example of England always appeals to me. England has the finest democracy in the whole world. What did they do? They had two or three occasions of crisis in that country. At the time of Queen Elizabeth, there was the Spanish Armada and it looked as if England would be invaded and the English people were afraid. The Spanish Armada was coming, and the people were trembling in their knees, but nature came to their rescue. There was a storm and the Spanish Armada was broken helter-skelter and England was saved. Then came the Napoleonic War—but I will refer to it later; I shall first refer to the Second World War. Hitler was about to invade England; France had collapsed and England stood alone practically. I shall now refer to the two volumes written by Winston Churchill about his War Memoirs. I cordially commend that book to every one of the hon. Members here. They should all read it. It is really worth reading and I am quite sure it will make us all better men, better legislators, better statesmen and better patriots. Such a good book it is. It contains details of what all Mr. Churchill did for his country, and it shows how but for him, England would have gone the way of France. He is the one man who worked day and night for saving his country, and it is he who saved the situation at the time.

9-50 a.m. "Then, Sir, what happened during the Napoleonic wars? Napoleon built a big navy and he wanted to invade England. Everything was ready. Then there was a big warrior in England, a naval warrior, Lord Nelson. He came to the rescue of England and we should remember his words. What did he say? He said 'England expects every man to do his duty.' Similarly, may we not say 'India expects every Indian to do his duty?' Let us go home with the words ringing in our ears, namely, 'Mother India expects every Indian to do his duty.' In that way let us do things and there is no good merely criticising each other. If you want to

13th March 1953] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

come to this side, by all means come by the ordinary democratic method, but there is no meaning in painting dark pictures of 'starvation deaths' and 'birds pecking on dead men' and so on. The Constitution provides a way for change of Government. What is happening in England? Parties change. Let us also learn from England and we have to learn a good deal from England. Though they have ruled us for nearly 200 years we have not learnt their high character, their discipline and the fine constitutional and democratic way in which they have been conducting themselves. Let us emulate them. I would request hon. Members to do their business in a democratic manner.

"In fact, we are as much anxious as hon. Members on the other side to give relief to the famine-stricken people and after all they are our people and our country is a great country with a great tradition behind it. In this country with all its variegated customs, we have a common bond. Take the case of dress. We have different kinds of dress; the people in the north dress themselves in one fashion and the people of the south in quite a different manner and in a peculiar way. Why dress? The food they take differs. In regard to time also, in Europe there is a particular hour for morning tea, lunch and so on. There is only a variation of an hour and a half. In our country in some cases lunch begins at 8-30 in the morning and goes right up to 3 o'clock. Yet with all these differences we have been getting on well all along; Why? It is all because of our great tradition and great culture. Ramayana and the Mahabharata are household words throughout India from the Himalayas in the north to Cape Comorin in the south. In fact all our festivals are common. In spite of our differences in language we have the same feeling of unity on account of our religion and culture. Now we are trying to disrupt it, and I may call it 'partition phobia.' We have got into that phobia and still we are tribal-minded. We must try to take a lesson from history. It was the divergent forces which worked about 400 or 500 years ago which brought about the invasion of India and we became slaves. The Rajputs began to fight with each other and they would rather see the Afghans coming and defeating their brother-king and enslave him rather than make friends with him. In that way we made this great land a slave country. But luckily we united ourselves in a novel way. Together we fought and got Independence for India and we must work again to retain that independence got after so much of struggle. On this occasion we cannot forget the great service rendered by the late Sardar Patel. The credit of bringing together all the small principalities, numbering about 500 or 600, under one administration, goes to him and what he did was far greater than what Bismarck did for Germany. As a great eminent statesman he did much for the country, but much is not heard about poor Sardar Patel for having done ten times greater service than Bismarck. I am sure history will give due place and write in golden words about the great services he has done in uniting this great country."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"On a point of order, Sir . . ."



[13th March 1953]

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Hon. Minister is not yielding. Order, order."

\* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"I wish my hon. Friend had been patient. I do not know why he is not tolerant for some time. However, I have to tolerate him for some time like that. I request him to have patience for some more time. I would in conclusion request all hon. Members to put their shoulders to the wheel and do something and make our country great in the comity of nations. Already the talk is wide that India counts for much in the international affairs. In fact, India takes the lead in peace affairs. Could you have imagined about 20 or 30 years ago that we might do such wonderful work? We should all get united and work together so that India will be a great country."

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—అధ్యక్ష, ఈ Rent Reduction Bill కు నేను నా amendments ను ప్రతిపాదించినమీద Hon. Revenue Minister గారు తన ఉపన్యాసములో ఏ ఒక చిన్నవాక్యము ఆయినా చేయబడినటువంటి విమర్శలకు సమాధానం చెప్పుతారని ఆశించినాను కాని, దాన్ని గురించి ఒక వాక్యము ఆయిననూ వారు చెప్పకపోవడము తోవనీయంగావుంది. అదిగాకుండా ఈబిల్లును ప్రతిపాదించడమువల్ల రాష్ట్రములో ఏర్పడినటువంటి ప్రమాద పరిస్థితులు ఏమాత్రం ప్రభుత్వం గుర్తించలేదని దీనివల్ల స్పష్టమగుచున్నది. ఎందుకంటే 1952 వ సంవత్సరములో ఈ శాసనసభలో యీబిల్లును ప్రతిపాదించడము, నెలెత్తు కమిటీని నియమించడము, నెలెత్తు కమిటీ యీబిల్లువల్ల రాష్ట్రములో తీవ్రమైన ప్రమాద పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడగలవని దీనిని నిరాకరించింది. అటువంటి బిల్లును మార్పుచేసి తిరిగి అదేబిల్లును యీశాసన సభలో ప్రతిపాదించ 'మౌనుకొనడము వల్ల ప్రజలయొక్క అభిప్రాయానికి వ్యతిరేక మయినందున, యీబిల్లును ప్రజలు నిరాకరిస్తారని చెప్పటకు నేను విచారింపచున్నాను. అందుచేత యీబిల్లును విరమిస్తే చాగుంటుందని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. మొదటితడవ యీబిల్లుయొక్క భావ 'Rent Reduction' అనే పేరుతో యీ బిల్లును ప్రతిపాదించ బడ్డది. ప్రభుత్వం చేసినటువంటి తప్పులు ఏదైనా వున్నట్లైతే, executive processes వల్ల తప్పులు దిద్దుకోవడానికి మాత్రం అధికారం కోరితే provisions చేర్చబడ్డవి. ఏ పారపాటు చేసినా దిద్దుకోవడానికి బిల్లులో అధికారం ఉన్నదా? వారుచేసిన పారపాట్లు ఏవియో తెలుసుకోకపోతే, ఆ పారపాట్లు ఎట్లు తెలుసుకోగలరు? అందువల్ల యీబిల్లును నేను అంగీకరించటానికి వీలుకాదు. అక్రమంగా యీ బిల్లును యీబిల్లు చేయటానికి అధికారం కావాలంటున్నప్పుడు క్రిందటి శాసనసభ నియమించిన క్రిందటి కమిటీలోమాడా అధికార ప్రకటనలో చాలా తప్పులు ఉన్నదని యీ ఎస్టేట్లుకు సంబంధించిన నెక్స్టు సవరణ చేయటానికి త్వరలో ఒక బిల్లు రానున్నదని ఆంబున్నారు. యివివరకు చేసిన తప్పులు దిద్దుకోవడానికి మాత్రం మాకు అధికారం ఉన్నది అని ప్రభుత్వం అంటే నేను కోరుతున్న ప్రకారం బిల్లును తీసుకొని రాకపోతే, తెలుగు జిల్లాలలో తీవ్రమైన ఆందోళన ప్రజలలో బయలుదేరుతుంది. ఈబిల్లు విషయములో యిప్పటికి ఒకటి, రెండు పర్యాయములు Estates నిర్వహణ చేయటాన్ని వదేశదే ప్రకటనలు మాత్రం చేస్తూ, ఒకమారు నెలెత్తు కమిటీ పరిశీలించిన బిల్లును తిరిగి ప్రతిపాదించడములో దీని ప్రజలు వ్యతిరేకించకుండా ఉంటారా లేదా, అనేది ఆలోచించాలని ప్రభుత్వానిని సాచ్చరిక చేస్తున్నాను దీనివల్ల కలిగే ప్రమాదాలు చాలా తీవ్రమైనవిగా కాగలదని అంటు

13th March 1953] [Sri G. Latchanna]

న్నాను. ఒక రాజకీయాన్ని రాష్ట్రంలో ఏర్పాటు చేయటానికి థాన్సి సాధించటానికి, వారియొక్క తలంపు ప్రకారం అందరికీ అవకాశము చేయాలనే ఉద్దేశ్యముతో, యీ బిల్లును తలపెట్టారని స్పష్టముగా తెలియచున్నది. ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రంలో ఎట్టేటు భూమి అనిపించుకోనేవి సుమారు అయిదువేల గ్రామాలు ఉన్నవి. ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రంలో ఎట్టేటు గ్రామాలు సుమారు అయిదువందల లక్షన్నవి. ఈ భూములు నిర్వచించడములలో ప్రభుత్వము నిమిషారపాట్లుచేసినా, పారపాట్లు దిద్దుకోటానికి ఒక యాక్టు కూడా వుండడము మంచిదే అని అనుకుంటే, గ్రామాలు అన్ని కూడా ఎట్టేట్లు అనిపించటానికి నీలులేక పోయినను హెకోర్టు తీర్పు ప్రకారం కట్టుబడకుండా గవర్నమెంటు తానుచేసిన తప్పులను దిద్దుకోవాలనే ఉద్దేశ్యముతో, ఒక నెక్ట్ను చేర్చారు. ఈ గ్రామాల్లో కొన్ని ఎట్టేటు గ్రామాలు కాదని నిరూపించటానికి ఈ ప్రభుత్వం యీ బిల్లును ప్రవేశపెట్టి వలసివచ్చిందని తెలుసుకోవలసి ఉంటుంది. అయిదువందల కాంగ్రెసు పరిపాలనా కాలంలో ప్రభుత్వం వారియొక్క అనుభవాన్ని బట్టి శిస్తు తగ్గుదలచేయడం, మరల చూచుకుంటున్నందున, నాలుగువందలనుండి శిస్తులు తగ్గుదలలో, తక్కువ శిస్తు తొలగించవలసి ఉంటుందని, చెప్పటం ఈ ప్రభుత్వ మేకాను, శిస్తు తగ్గించు అమలును విప్రభుత్వ శాసనము రద్దుచేయలేదు. మరెన్ని ప్రభుత్వాలు వచ్చినను, రద్దుచేయలేదని యీ ప్రభుత్వానికి ఖచ్చితముగా చెప్పుతున్నాను. ఇది చాలా ప్రమాద మైనటువంటి పరిస్థితి. ఈరోజున ప్రభుత్వ శాసనాలు ఉండటానికి వీలుకాదు అనలేదు. నాలుగువేల గ్రామాలలోని రైతులు యీ శాసనమును తిరస్కరించుతారని చెప్పే ముందు యీ బిల్లును సరిదిద్దవలసిందే అని చెప్పేయవలసి ప్రభుత్వాన్ని కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లును యింక విచారణలో తీసుకొనివచ్చిననూ, ప్రజానీకము దీన్ని తిరస్కరించి తిరుపారని నేను వదేపదే చెప్పనూ అధిరసారిగా తీవ్రంగాను మనఃపూర్వకముగాను ప్రభుత్వానికి తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లు శాసనసభకుండు 'పెట్టవద్దు', 'పెట్టవద్దు'. ఒకమారు శాసన సభయొక్క అభిప్రాయం తీసుకొనుటకు యీ బిల్లును ప్రవేశపెట్టితే, శాసనసభ అభిప్రాయము ఏర్పడి, ఆప్తుడు pass చేస్తామంటే, అది మరొక proposal అని చెప్పి, అది ఉండవలసింది అని అంటారు. ఏ కారణముల వల్లనే యిదివరకు Land Revenue Surcharge Bill ను గరించి చెప్పేటప్పుడు గవర్నరుగారు తన ఉపన్యాస ప్రకటనలో ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్ర నిర్మాణం జరిగి, విభజన ఏర్పాట్లపట్ల జరిగేటటువంటి తీవ్ర ఆందోళన దాగింద ఈనాడు ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్ర సందర్భములో ఆయా రాష్ట్రాల ప్రాంతాలలోని రైతులకు సహజమైన వాస్తవిక పరిస్థితుల గమనించక శాసనాలను చేయడం ప్రజాభిప్రాయానికి వ్యతిరేకము గాబట్టి, యీ బిల్లును విరమించుకోగలందులకు కోరుతున్నాను. Land Revenue Surcharge Bill ను విరమించుకున్నట్లుగా, యీ బిల్లుగూడ ప్రభుత్వము విరమించవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను. ఒకవేళ యీ బిల్లును మొండి తనముతో ప్రభుత్వము ప్రవేశపెట్టి ప్యాసుచేసినట్లయితే, ప్రజలలో అరాచకము తప్పకుండా బయలుదేరితీరుతుంది, వాళ్లవద్దనుంచి శిస్తు వసూలు చేయలేదు. అని మాత్రం తెలియజేస్తున్నాను.

“రెండవది, రైతులు చెల్లించవలసిన క్యాపు రెంటు విషయములలో ప్రభుత్వము ఒక ప్రకటనచేసింది. Kind rents చెల్లించడమనేది గ్రామాలలో రైతులకు చాలా అన్యాయము జరుగుతుందని అంటున్నాను. దీని విషయములో అనేకమార్లు శాసనసభలో కూడా ఆందోళన జరిపిస్తున్నాము. Rent Reduction Amendment Act తిరిగి మరొక విధంగా యీ ప్రభుత్వము ప్రవేశపెట్టడం అంటే అర్థంలేకుండావున్నది. ఈ బిల్లును మరేవిధంగానైన ప్రవేశపెట్టటానికి వీలులేదు. రైతులయొక్క ఆందోళనలను బట్టి ఈ వ్యవహారములలో యిదివరకు రైతులకు చేసిన వాగ్దానాలనుబట్టి, యీ బిల్లు



[Sri G. Latchanna]

[13th March 1954]

సంగతి ఏమి జరిగిందని ప్రభుత్వాన్ని అడిగితే, దానికి జవాబు 'still under consideration, still under serious consideration, still under the sympathetic consideration of the Government' గవర్నమెంటు ఏమి చర్య తీసుకున్నది చెప్పకుండా, శుష్కవాదులు యిస్తున్నారు. ఈ బిల్లు విషయములో ప్రభుత్వం తీసుకున్న చర్యలు, దీని stage, తెలియజేయకపోవడమునకు విచారించుచున్నాను.

“ప్రభుత్వము చేయవలసిన క్రొత్త నీటిపథాలు మరమ్మతులు మాత్రం చేయకుండానే శిస్తు మాత్రం వసూలుచేయుట అన్యాయం. వెనుకటి జమీందార్లు తయారుచేసిన property records ను ఆధారంగా పెట్టుకొని, రైతులపద్దతుంచి Dewan గారు, ఎస్టేటు మానేజరుగారు, రెవిన్యూ యిన్స్పెక్టరు శిస్తులు బకాయిలతోగూడా వసూలుచేయటానికి వత్తిడి చేస్తున్నారు. అలా శిస్తులు చెల్లించకపోయినవడం జప్తులు చేయడం జరుగుతున్నది. లేకపోతే వేరే గత్యంతరములేకుండా ఉన్నారు. కొత్త మరమ్మతులు చేయవలసినా, పాత మరమ్మతులు అయినా చేయకుండా తప్పిలు రెక్కలనుబట్టి బకాయిలతో సహా శిస్తులు వసూలుచేయడం న్యాయంకాదు. మరమ్మతులు చేయకుండా శిస్తులు వసూలుచేయటానికి ప్రభుత్వానికి హక్కులేదు. వారు చేయవలసిన మరమ్మతులు చేయకుండా పాత జమీందార్లు నాలుగు, అయిదు సంవత్సరాల క్రింద తయారుచేసిన తప్పుడు రెక్కలను ఆధారంచేసుకొని వసూలును మోసలుపెట్టుతున్నారు. మరమ్మతులు ఎందుకుచేయించరు అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఈ విషయంలో నేను కలెక్టరుకు ఒక రిపోర్టు యిచ్చాను. కలెక్టరును ఆ రిపోర్టు ఏమిచేశారని అడగగా, తహశీల్దారుకు పంపానన్నాడు. తహశీల్దారుని అడిగితే, రివిన్యూ యిన్స్పెక్టరుకు పంపానన్నాడు. రెవిన్యూ యిన్స్పెక్టరు గ్రామాలకు వెళ్లకుండా తనపద్ద పెట్టుకొని ఆనవసరంగా కాలయాపన చేస్తున్నాడు. గ్రామాలలో రెండేండ్లు, మూడేండ్లుగా మరమ్మతులు లేనందున, ప్రజలకు శిస్తు చెల్లించటానికి బాధ్యతలేదు. ప్రభుత్వానికి అంతకు ముందే నైతికంగా హక్కులేదు. ఉదాహరణకు ఫింపేట తాలూకా కేసనగుడి గ్రామంలో శిస్తులు బకాయిలతో చెల్లించనందున రామయ్య అనే ఒక రైతు ఎడ్లను జప్తుచేసి, తీసుకొని వెళ్లడమేగాకుండా, పె పెప్పు అతనిపై కేసుపెట్టారు. రైతులు మూడేండ్లనుంచి మరమ్మతులు కోరుతున్నారు. మరమ్మతు లేక పోవడములో కరువులేదని ఆనగలరా? కాని సూటికి నూరు వంతులు కరువు తగ్గితేనే కరువులేండా శిస్తులు చెల్లించగలరు. రామరాజ్య కాలంలోగూడా కరువు వుందని చెప్పేవాళ్లు. ఈ కరువు అనేది యీ కాలంలో వచ్చిందికాదు. పూర్వంనుంచి పరిస్థితులు అప్పుడప్పుడు తారుమారుగానే వుంటువచ్చినవి. అంతేగాని యీ కరువు యీనాడు కొత్తగా వుట్టినదికాదు. ఆ కాలంలోగూడా కరువువస్తే శిస్తులు రిమిషన్లు వగైరాలుగూడా వుంటావచ్చినవి అని చెప్పేవాళ్లు. రైతులనుండి జబర్దస్తిగా శిస్తులు మాత్రం వసూలు చేస్తున్నారు. ఇటీవల రెవిన్యూ మినిస్టరుగారికి యీ శిస్తుల బిల్లును గురించి మనవిచేస్తూ, యీ శిస్తులు వసూలు వెంటనే ఆపుచేయమని ఆర్డరు పంపవలసిందిగా కోరగా మీకు రాష్ట్రము వస్తుందిగా, మీరెందుకు ఆందోళనపడతారని అన్నారు. శిస్తులు వసూలు చేయుట ఆపకపోతే, రైతులు చాలా యిబ్బందిపడతారని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. అదిన్నీ కాకుండా మూడు మాసాలుగా మరమ్మతులు చేయకుండా, శిస్తులు వసూలు చేస్తామనటం చాలా మూడు మాసాలుగా మరమ్మతులు చేయకుండా, శిస్తులు వసూలుచేస్తామనటం చాలా అన్యాయం. మరియు శిస్తులు బకాయిలతోగూడ ఒకే సంవత్సరములో వసూలు చేస్తున్నారు. ఈ విధానం ఎవరిని బలపరచటానికో తెలియడంలేదు. ఆత్మవిశ్వాసకరమైన విధానమును ప్రభుత్వము ఎంత త్వరగా మార్చుకుంటే అంత మంచిదని చెప్పుతున్నాను. అట్లాకాకుండా శిస్తులు ముందు వసూలుచేస్తాము, మరమ్మతు మాట తర్వాత చూస్తాము అంటే, శిస్తులు వసూలుచేయటానికి ప్రభుత్వానికి హక్కు

13th March 1953]

[Sri G. Latchanna]

విమాత్రం లేదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. పంటలు పండలేదు. రిమిషనులు యివ్వాలని రైతులు మొర పెట్టుకొనినను, గవర్నమెంటు రివెన్యూ యిన్స్పెక్టరు వెల్లి ప్రజలను భాధించమనేది చాలా అన్యాయం, అక్రమము అని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. గవర్నమెంటు యీ విధానమును అవలంబించి తమ ఉద్యోగులను వసూలుపర్చటానికి ప్రోత్సహించటము న్యాయముకాదు. అందువల్ల యిటువంటి అరాచకాన్ని ప్రోత్సహించకుండా త్వరలో ప్రభుత్వము చర్యతీసుకోవాలి.

“ఇకపోతే electricity వ్యవహారాలు చూస్తే, అవికూడా ప్రభుత్వానికి డబ్బులేదని అభిప్రాయపడతారు. అందువల్ల వ్యవసాయము అభివృద్ధికానేరదు. ప్రభుత్వానికి పన్నులు వసూలుచేయడానికి హక్కువుంది అనేటట్లయితే, ప్రజలకు మరమ్మతులు చేయించి, నీటి సౌకర్యాలు చూడటం ప్రభుత్వము పరిశీలించకుండావుంటే, ప్రజాస్వామిక సూత్రాలకు వ్యతిరేకమైనటువంటి విధానము యీ ప్రభుత్వము అవలంబించుచున్నదని చెప్పకతప్పదు. మరమ్మతులు చేయించితే, పన్నులు వసూలుచేయడానికి ఎలాంటి అభ్యంతరము ఉండదు అని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ప్రభుత్వము యీ విషయంలో త్వరలో తగు చర్యతీసుకోమని కోరుతున్నాను.

“మరొక విషయము మనవిచేస్తాను. ఈ Rent Reduction Act మీద రెవెన్యూ కోర్టువారు యిచ్చిన తీర్పును హైకోర్టుకు refer చేయడము సహజమైన విషయము. తీర్పులను సాగించటానికి, ఆ తీర్పులను అమలుపరచటానికి ఎంతమాత్రము కావాలని కాదు. ఈ బిల్లును తిరిగి శాసనసభలో ప్రవేశపెట్టటానికి యీ ప్రభుత్వము ఎందుకు ప్రయత్నిస్తున్నదో నాకు అర్థము కావడములేదు. ఎందుకంటే యీనాములమీద హక్కులేదని నేను భావించుచున్నాను. అందుచేత యీ Rent Reduction Act ను తప్పనిసరిగా ప్రభుత్వము విరమించవలసిందిగా మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ Rent Reduction Act మాత్రం వి పరిస్థితులలోనూగూడా ప్రవేశపెట్టకుండా, ఏ కారణాల వల్లనైనా గానా బిల్లు Land Revenue Surcharge Bill ను postpone చేయడము వల్లనూ మరల యీ బిల్లును శాసనసభలో ప్రవేశపెట్టకుండా postpone చేయమని కోరుచున్నాను. అట్లు postpone చేయకుండా శాసనసభలో ప్రవేశపెట్టితే రైతులకు అన్యాయము ప్రభుత్వము చేసిందట్లు అభిప్రాయపడుచు మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ప్రభుత్వానికి ఒకవేళ యీ బిల్లును ప్రవేశపెట్టి వ్యాసుచేయించాలని ఉద్దేశ్యమున్నట్లయితే, దీన్ని Select Committee యొక్క అభిప్రాయముకొరకు పంపి, ఆ తర్వాత వారి అభిప్రాయము యీ సభలో చర్చింపజేయమని కోరుతున్నాను. అట్లు చేయకపోతే estate గ్రామాలలోని రైతులకు చాలా అన్యాయము జరుగుతుంది లేదా ప్రజల అభిప్రాయముకొరకు యీ బిల్లు విషయములను ప్రకటించమని కోరుతున్నాను. ప్రభుత్వము యీ బిల్లు విషయముతో తగు చర్య తీసుకోవలసియున్నది. ప్రజల అభిప్రాయానికి విరుద్ధముగా నడచి శిస్తు వసూలుకు దిగితే, ప్రజలనుంచి శిస్తులు యే మాత్రము వసూలుకాదని భృథముగా చెప్పుచున్నాను.

“ఇక ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రము విషయములో సభ్యులందరు వారివారి అభిప్రాయాలను తెలియజేసారు. శ్రీ చెట్టినాథురాజుగారు నూ ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రము, మా భవిష్యత్తును గురించి చాలాకాలము యీ సభలో ఉపన్యసించినందుకు నా కృతజ్ఞత తెలుపవలసివుంది. వారికి నూ ఆంధ్రుల నాయకత్వములో ఆనవసరము. ముందు రాజోయ్యే ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వ మంత్రివర్గము విషయము వారు యిప్పుడే చాలా శ్రద్ధతీసుకొని మాట్లాడారు. ఇదంతయు వారికి వివిధముగా ఆనవసరంగా మాకు తెలియలేదు. ఆంధ్రులు అధికారములోనికి వచ్చినప్పుడు, వారి విషయములు వారు చూడుకోగలరు. అంతేకాని, చెట్టినాథు రాజు కుత్తయ్య నిట్టియార్ యొక్క గొలహలు మాకు పని



[Sri G. Latchanna]

[13th March 1953]

లేదని వారికి తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. సోదరులవర విడిపోకపోలే రక్త ప్రవాహాలు జరుగుతవని ఆనడం మంచిదికాదు. ఈ విషయం వారు ముఖ్యంగా గ్రహించాలి. ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రము ఏ రూపములో, ఏ రోజున వస్తుందో యింకను తెలియలేదు. మద్రాసు పట్టణము ఆంధ్రులకు రాజధానిగాగాని, తాత్కాలికంగాగాని ఆరవలు వచ్చు కోసకపోవడం చాలా శోచనీయమైన విషయం. ఇదికాకుండా బఖారి మద్రాసులో చేర్చవలసింది ఆనడం దురన్యాయము, ఆంధ్ర, తమిళ రాజధానులు మద్రాసులోనే ఉంచటమనేది ఉభయాలకు శ్రేయస్కరమని నా అభిప్రాయము. ఈ రెండు రాష్ట్రాలు కొత్త ప్రభుత్వాలు ఏర్పడినప్పుడు వారివారి రాష్ట్రాల ఆభివృద్ధిపరచుకొనుట చాలా అవసరమైయున్నది. అందువల్ల అధిక ప్రసంగాలకుమాత్రము దిగకుండా ముందు వ్యవహారాన్ని సాగించుకొనుటకు ప్రయత్నించవలసిందని కోరుతూ యింతటితో విరమించుకొంటున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Sri K. Uppi Sahib will now speak."

\*SRI G. ANJANEYULU:—"ఆధ్యక్ష యిప్పడీ సభలో ఆనుసరిస్తున్న policy యేమోనాకు ఆర్థికావటంలేదు. నేను యిప్పటికి ము రోజులనుండి మాట్లాడుటకు పేరుయిచ్చి ఎప్పుడు పేరు వస్తుందో అని 8-30 గంటల నుండి 2 గంటల వరకు యిచ్చట కూర్చోని యెదురుదూస్తున్నాను. యింతవరకు chance యివ్వలేదు కాని యిట్టేవచ్చి వెల్లిపోయే గౌరవనీయుడు సభ్యుడు ముత్యయ్య శెట్టియారు గారికి మాత్రము, విద్యేహాలు రచ్చకొట్టెందుకు మాట్లాడేదానికి అవకాశ మిచ్చినారు. సభ్యులు మాట్లాడుటకు యేవిధంగా అవకాశాలు యిస్తున్నారో ఆర్థికావటంలేదు."

10-20  
a.m.

MR. SPEAKER:—"I think the hon. Member is saying that I have not allowed him to speak. It is not possible for me to allow all the 375 Members to speak."

\*SRI K. UPPI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the outset I wish to reiterate the policy of the Muslim League. The Muslim League stands for a good and stable government in this country. The people who were at the helm of affairs soon after we got independence were inexperienced, hasty and over-anxious to lift this State to a pinnacle. Perhaps in their anxiety to do good to the country, they did things which landed this Government in a mire. There was surplus money in those days and a peculiar sort of budgeting was resorted to. Large sums of money were set apart for schemes, about the details of which the originators themselves had no idea. The details were worked out only after funds were set apart. That was the sort of budgeting that was followed then. The result is that the country has been driven almost to the verge of bankruptcy. Persons who inaugurated schemes like the producer-cum-consumer societies in Malabar and the Firka Development Scheme did not have a full picture of the schemes before them when they set apart the funds for these schemes. We were wishing for somebody to come to rescue our State. The Muslim League Party was then the main Opposition. But it was infinitesimally small minority; our voice could not be heard and our efforts did not bear much fruit. Fortunately for this State when Sri Rajagopalachariar took up the reins of Government soon after the elections, we felt that here was a man who would guide the State aright and restore good government. Looking into the

13th March 1953] [Sri K. Uppl]

history of this State for the last one year, we fell to-day that our confidence was not misplaced. I have made this statement several times and I repeat it in this House once again that for his one act, namely, decontrol of food alone, I for one should be grateful to him throughout my life. Food control was eating into the morale of our society like a canker. Control of food demoralized the people and made them addicts to a process of spoonfeeding. Slowly people were losing the incentive for cultivation. They became more and more dependent on the rice supplied through governmental agencies. Our economy was badly shaken. Sri Rajagopalachariar removed that control. When one heard several Members of this House complaining about the shooting up of the price of rice, one would be led to consider that decontrol was the cause for it. I am sure there are no two other persons either in this House or outside who are more anxious to keep down the prices than our Chief Minister and the Food Minister for reasons obvious. Before decontrol, what was the situation in our State? No doubt the price of ration rice was lower than the present market price. But the blackmarket price was exorbitant. Poor and middle class people could not afford to purchase all the rice that they required. After decontrol, I have heard poor people say: 'For the eight years that control has been in force, one morsel of good rice did not go down our throat. After the removal of control, we are able to secure at least one or two morsels of good rice every day'. The rise in price is not as much as it was last year when it was obtained only in blackmarket. I say that the rise is not on account of decontrol but for other reasons. On the other hand, competition in the open market is a sufficient guarantee against exorbitant rise in prices. I once again express my gratitude to the Hon. Chief Minister for the lifting of food control.

"The Hon. Chief Minister has handled the burning question of the difficulties of handloom weavers and the situation that arose as a result of the Police strike in an able and admirable manner."

**SRI G. SATYANARAYANA:**—"On a point of order, ఆధ్యక్షా, గవర్నరుగారి ఉపన్యాసంపై వచ్చే ప్రారంభించటానికి ముందు నేను మీ చేంబరులో మీ డగ్గరకు వచ్చి ఒక Adjournment motion ను పెట్టబోతున్నాను అనుమతి ఇవ్వాలని మిమ్మలకు కోరగా, అవసరము లేదు, గవర్నరుగారి ఉపన్యాసముపై చర్చ వస్తుంది అప్పుడు మీరు మాట్లాడవలసింది మాట్లాడవచ్చునని చెప్పి నాకు మాట్లాడుటకు అవకాశం యిస్తానని వాగ్దానము చేసారు. ఆ వాగ్దానము యేమైనా తెలియలేదు. ఈ అసెంబ్లీలో ముస్లిం సభ్యులు ఆరుగురు వుంటే, యింతవరకు ఆరుగురు సభ్యులకు మాట్లాడటానికి అవకాశము యిచ్చారు. అరవవారు ఉపసాహాయుగారు మాట్లాడుటకు అనుమతి యిచ్చారు. ఈ విధంగా ప్రభుత్వము తరఫున వున్న సభ్యులకు chance యిస్తున్నారేగాని మా Opposition సభ్యులకు chance యివ్వడము లేదు. ఈ సభా కార్యక్రమము యొక్క policy ఏమిటో నాకు అర్థము కావడం లేదు. ఈ విషయములో మీ రూలింగు యివ్వాలని కోరుతున్నాను."

**MR. SPEAKER:**—"I have not been able to understand the hon. Member fully, but I think he said that he gave notice of an



[Mr. Speaker]

[13th March 1953]

adjournment motion and in that connexion I told him that I would allow him to speak on the Governor's Address. It is not possible to allow all the 375 Members to speak."

**SRI G. SATYANARAYANA.**—“అధ్యక్షా, నేను చెప్పేది మీర అర్థం చేసుకోవడం లేదు. నేను చెప్పేదానిని దువరిచేతనైనా ఇంగ్లీషులో తర్జుమా చేయించు కొని చూపమిద మీ రూలింగు యివ్వవలసినదిగా కోరుచున్నాను.”

**MR. SPEAKER.**—“I am not going to allow a debate on this matter. This is not the way to raise a point of order. Mr. Uppi Sahib will continue his speech.”

\* **SRI K. UPPI.**—“Sir, I understand that the hon. Member raised a point of order. Is it with reference to my speech?”

**MR. SPEAKER.**—“That has nothing to do with the hon. Member's speech.”

10-30  
a.m.

\* **SRI K. UPPI.**—“I express my personal gratitude to the Government. There are many problems to be solved, and this Government have so far behaved in a very statesmanlike manner. We stand for a stable and good government in this country. It is for that purpose alone we are supporting the Government. But I have to say that so far as minorities are concerned, the Government have not solved the problem quite satisfactorily. The previous Governments for reasons of their own had not been very just to the minorities, and the same state of affairs continues. In the matter of employment, contracts, etc., the minorities are still suffering from the same disabilities. I am only giving expression to the feelings of the minorities.

“I now come to the question of supplying electricity to my district, namely, Malabar. I must say that Malabar has been treated in a step-motherly way. Last year when Rs. 8 crores was proposed to be spent on electricity, Malabar was allotted only a paltry sum of Rs. 14 lakhs. Even the Hon. the Chief Minister noticed it, and admitted that it was a very small sum that Malabar got. I hope in this year's budget, he will have provided a bigger amount to supply electricity to Malabar.

“Coming to the grow-more-food department, I say that it is time that that department is abolished. It is a waste of public money. Only a moiety of it might have gone to grow more food. I ask the Hon. the Minister for Food whether by spending crores of rupees on grow-more-food campaign, more food has actually been produced. Has the Grow More Food Campaign produced more food even in a small proportion to the huge amount of money spent? In those days, I was repeatedly saying in the other House that the grow-more-food department was a waste. Except for some minor irrigation works executed in Malabar, the whole money spent on grow-more-food was a waste.

“I would once more bring to the notice of the Government the question of the colonization of Wynaad. There is a hue and cry there that money is wasted. I hope the Government will look into this matter.”

13th March 1953]

**MR. SPEAKER:**—"The hon. Member's time is up. The hon. Member Dr. K. B. Menon will now speak."

\* **DR. K. B. MENON:**—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, His Excellency the Governor in his Address to the joint session catalogued some works the Congress Ministry did or attempted to do. My complaint is that considering the times that we are living in, the Constitutional Head of the State should have made a soul-stirring analysis and given an inspiring lead. He has failed to do both these. I shall address myself first, in the few minutes that are at my disposal, to a brief discussion on food. Prices are soaring everywhere. During the two months when I was in my place, the price of foodgrains went up from Re. 1-2-0 per para to Rs. 3-8-0 per para or Rs. 4 per para. My information is that most of the buying was done by rice mill owners who are on the borders. Immediately controls were lifted, there was heavy smuggling of foodgrains from Malabar into the deficit and semi-deficit adjoining districts. My suggestion to the Government is that they should check the stock with the rice mill owners, and see that they do not corner the supply, nor do they raise the prices in periods of scarcity. There was widespread drought throughout Malabar. In the rice-growing area of Palghat, particularly, there was complete drying up of the crops leaving only fodder for the cattle. In Walluvanad taluk, on account of the heavy pumping from the Bharatapuzha, more than one-third of the crop was saved. Both arecanut and coconut plantations have suffered on account of failure of rain. I submit to the Government that some kind of relief is necessary, and I also suggest to Government that whatever relief they give, they should see that the relief reaches not the *jenmis* but the actual cultivators. Particularly, the coming two months in Malabar will be very difficult months, and the Government should have an eye on that deficit area. My submission is that if the supply of rice in urban areas is taken care of, there will be no drain from the villages to the towns. If this is prevented, there will be some relief to the poor people in the country parts. Now famine is stalking the land. Previously famine was limited to dry areas like Rayalaseema. Now it has spread to Tamil Nad and parts of Malabar. It is time that the Government changed their tactics. The Finance Minister certainly deserves to be congratulated if he raised Rs. 10 crores and spent it on famine relief measures. When I say that there should be a change of tactics, I mean that the Government should shift from the curative method to the preventive. We should attempt more to prevent the recurrence of famine rather than attempt palliative measures whenever and wherever famine occurs. I know that it is difficult to do it. The Damocles' sword of starvation will always hang over the head of the starving poor, and there will always be the problem of recurring famines for the State if substantial preventive measures are not taken. The question, when it comes to preventive measures, is one of raising finance. I admit that new measures of taxation cannot be imposed, for we have almost reached the point of saturation. The only way to get money is



[Dr. K. B. Menon]

[13th March 1953]

by effecting economy and efficiency in the administrative structure. My feeling is that there is considerable scope for both. From the point of view of economy, I feel that there are departments in the Madras State which are doing absolutely no work. They can easily be scrapped. I do not see the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation here. He recently started the Dairy Development Department. That Development Department takes about Rs. 2,500 in salary bills and about Rs. 500 as travelling allowances. My information is that that Department is a complete waste and that no work is done by the Department. Even the officers do not attend their office, and they do not even sign the attendance register every day but they sign once or twice a week. Whenever they go out on tour, they do not go to the announced destination but go elsewhere. There is complete neglect in that department. That is my information. I hope the Hon. Minister concerned will institute an enquiry and do the needful. There are other officers who are getting heavy work done by the departments, but they do nothing themselves. I wish to bring more facts and place them before the Minister when the budget discussion comes up. My submission is that there is considerable scope for economy in the Madras State. As far as the officials are concerned, there are officials even in the Secretariat who do not attend office regularly, but who come and pay occasional visits. Such officers have no work, and they also should go. This much of economy can be effected in the administration of the State. As far as efficiency is concerned, particularly in the critical and famine areas, there is complete lack of co-operation and co-ordination between the departments. I am afraid that I have to join my friends in the House in the chorus of complaints raised against the Agricultural Department. The Agricultural Research Stations that are now functioning in different parts of the State are not working in close co-operation with the people. The people are not acquainted with their working. Some of them do not even know that there is such a department functioning. Whenever seeds are bought by the farmers—in a few cases I know from my own personal experience—when they are sown, they do not yield the desired result. Sometimes they do not even germinate. When one such experience is there, the experiment station is condemned and the people do not go there any more. As regards supply of pumps, there are not enough pumps in that first place to serve the district, to serve the affected areas, and even when there are pumps, they are supplied at such a heavy cost that an average small-holder is unable to make use of them. I understand that there is a mechanic attached to each pump and, to maintain him throughout the year while the pump is used only for a limited period of time, is, I think, a waste. Some kind of economy could be effected in this respect.

“As far as the lack of co-ordination and co-operation between the departments is concerned, I am afraid there is no co-operation between the Revenue Department and the Engineering Department, and between the district board and the Highways Department. Whenever schemes are enquired into and whenever they are

10-40  
a.m.

13th March 1953] [Dr. K. B. Menon]

recommended, if they are recommended by the Engineering Department, they are torpedoed by the Revenue Department. If a scheme is approved by the Highways Department, it is passed on to the district board for execution and then given up. In this way, work is not being done. That is my experience. In the last one year, though I have suggested some schemes for my constituency, not a single scheme has been carried out. We are talking in the Assembly, probably Ministers are doing their best, but the departments are sabotaging the whole thing. Efficiency co-operation and co-ordination between heads of departments should be brought about. That is my submission to the Government.

"Next, I wish to say just a word about the Malabar Tenancy Act. Ever since that Tenancy Act was brought into operation, there has been a clamour for change. When it was introduced, it was thought that it would be as a relief. But, on the other hand, it roused complaints both from the tenant and from the landlord. We have been promised that amendments to the Act will be introduced but no amendments have so far been introduced. In hundreds of thousands of cases, stay orders have been passed. A tenant does not pay the rent and the landlord is unable to collect it from him. Then the landlord goes and tries to evict the tenant. So, there is a considerable amount of distress and discontent throughout Malabar. If my information is correct, Rajaji's amendment to the provision relating to eviction of tenants is not different from what is in Mr. Madhava Menon's Bill. If that is so, the Hon. the Law Minister who will be piloting the Bill in the Assembly will have a rough House to deal with.

"I think I should not close my speech without making some reference to the separation of Andhra. I am very unhappy about the separation. That feeling has been expressed by very many hon. Members of the Assembly. The time chosen was bad. No one wants to see one's trusted comrades and friends leave bag and baggage, but that is certain to happen now. Even though I do not like the separation, I cannot but admire the patient persistence and the passionate vigour with which the Andhras fought for what they thought they wanted, and they have got it. Now, it is almost an accomplished fact. There is no use of offering any criticism. I wish the new State every luck in the future. It is a matter for regret that the demand for the Andhra State could not be achieved through peaceful means. The Centre did not have the imagination to grant it at the proper time. They delayed and delayed until the resentment of the Andhras rose to a pitch by the death of Sri Potti Sriramulu, and resulted in arson and other forms of violence and destruction of property. It gave the impression that the Andhra State was born in the womb of violence. Although peaceful methods like making representations, waiting in deputation, and speeches on public platforms were adopted, when the demand was conceded by the Centre, it seemed as if it was a triumph of violence, which certainly the Centre should have avoided. I cannot blame the State Government, for yesterday the Hon. the Chief Minister made a statement that the State



[Dr. K. B. Menon]

[13th March 1953]

Government had no policy on such issues. I said that I was not very happy about the separation. That does not necessarily mean that I am against linguistic division of the country. It only means that the demand was ill-timed. We are just out of a struggle. Only recently we gained our Independence and we should concentrate all our attention and effort on meeting problems on a national basis. History is back of me when I make that contention. The history of France and the history of the United States of America after the Revolution bear full testimony to the fact that there was an outburst of nationalism after the Revolution and they gave all their attention to rebuilding their nations. In our country, we have limited resources. We can mobilize those limited resources that are at our disposal only when we stand together and fight together. I have no objection if the people want a division of the country on a linguistic basis. But we should not divert our attention and scatter our resources. Madras State as a State has lost its status and stature by this division. Madras State with its 60 million population can never have the pride of place in the comity of States in the Indian Union when she is divided into small States. In this connexion, I would say that we could strengthen the economic position of our country by having a common High Court, a common Governor and a common Assembly. That should be effected, I would suggest, even by merging Part 'B' and Part 'C' States like Travancore-Cochin and Coorg into the residuary State and reconstituting ourselves into a larger State. Those are bigger problems on which I should not express a definite opinion at this stage and I do not express a definite opinion at this stage. But what I mean to say is that any effort to divide ourselves at this stage is only an effort to weaken ourselves and I hope that there will be no further moves in that direction. Thank you, Sir."

\* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, for the last three days the House has been debating the Address by the Governor. The Address of the Governor is the policy statement of the Government. That is a statement telling us what exactly they propose to do in the coming months.

"We have been regaled during the last few weeks, not on the floor of this House but in another place, that the country has been passing through an economic upsurge. During the last one year, we have been told, the economy of the country is on the upgrade, and that production has been going up. The President of the Republic has been telling us that the economic ills of the country are to-day on the point of being solved and that the country has got to be grateful for the policies that have been pursued by the Government. But going through the speech of the Governor, we find a different tale altogether. I am glad that the picture of the state of affairs painted in the Governor's Address corresponds to the actual reality to some extent at least. He told us that the people of this State were extremely glad and grateful at the visit of the President of the Republic and the Prime Minister of the country to this State, who, it is stated, brought

13th March 1953] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

cheer and hope to the people. At any rate I do not find that hope and cheer reflected in the Address of the Governor. I do not find that this Government have been inspired by the great hope and cheer supposed to have been created by the President and Prime Minister. If they had been inspired, they would have told us that they expect to improve the conditions obtaining in this State by adopting suitable measures. They have not done any such thing and there is no mention of any such measures in the Governor's Address. Nonetheless, I would like to say that the Address has not given us a true picture of the state of affairs in this State.

"The most significant feature that strikes me in the Address is this. So much has been made of the Five-Year Plan in the past. Everybody was talking about this Plan. Our own Chief Minister made a broadcast immediately after the Plan was published. But after the publication of that Plan, what do we find? Even in this session, let us see how this Plan is referred to in the Governor's Address. In the whole Address we find only one sentence about this Plan and that is in paragraph 7 on page 3, which says, 'Agriculture continues to engage the attention of Government and efforts are being made to give priority to the schemes under the Five-Year Plan.' Under the present conditions of distress and terrific famine prevailing in the State, that is the one sentence that we find regarding the Five-Year Plan. I take it that the Madras Government themselves do not expect much out of this Five-Year Plan and they do not expect to solve the many problems connected with agriculture, food production, relief of famine conditions and so on by adopting the Five-Year Plan. That is why I say that no detailed reference has been made in the Governor's Address about the Five-Year Plan, and only a passing reference has been made.

"Now let us see what has been the condition in the State during the last nine months. Nine months ago, when the present Chief Minister assumed the reins of office, it was said that he has come as a saviour to this State, stability of Government is assured and as stability of Government is assured, the people's ills are going to be at an end. What have the last nine months proved? What have those nine months brought us in reality? Do we notice any improvement in the situation? I am not saying that all the problems of this country, which are the legacy of 200 years' British imperialism in this country, can be solved overnight. Are we on the road leading to the solution of these problems? Have things improved during the last nine months? I am sorry to say that during the last nine months the situation has very much deteriorated and the State has been going backward. Have the Government done anything towards the solution of the problem of mass unemployment, scarcity of foodgrains, famine condition and so on? I am of the view that all these problems have increased by leaps and bounds, and are also increasing every day. That is the simple question which I want to raise on the floor of the House.



[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[13th March 1953]

"Sir, enough has been talked of the food situation. Member after Member from the other side got up and painted a picture of the famine conditions that are spreading from district to district. It is no longer a famine confined to Rayalaseema alone. It has been spreading from district to district. Almost all the districts of Tamil Nad and even some of the districts in the Circars are experiencing distress conditions. That is the picture which they painted. Member after Member from the Congress side got up and congratulated Rajaji, but blamed the Government. I do not know what the reaction of Rajaji himself will be to this, and whether he will take it as an encomium for himself or otherwise. He is the head of the administration and he is the head of the Government. When those Members congratulate Rajaji and at the same time blame the Government headed by him, what do they mean? Do they want to divest the responsibilities of administration from Rajaji? I am not able to understand what exactly they mean by praising Rajaji in one breath and in another criticising the action of the Government. I take their criticism only as a reflection of the people's desire. In spite of their sitting on the side of the Congress party, in spite of their sitting with the Ministerialist party, Member after Member from the Congress benches was forced to get up and refer to the terrible conditions prevailing in various parts of the State at the present time. The actual conditions are really very bad as they themselves have been forced to admit. I do not want to dilate upon this point too long. But the fact remains that a very serious situation is facing us. However much the Ministers may say that we are drawing a very gruesome picture of the actual conditions, we cannot but refer to them. We have to face realities. Somebody from outside is not pointing out the real situation. It is the Members from the Congress side who are referring to it. So there is no use of blaming us in the matter.

"Now, let me pass on to the other aspects. Sir, I know perfectly well that the State Government are not in a position to do what all we want them to do. I therefore want to rouse you to action against those who are preventing the State Government from doing the correct thing for the people. I want to rouse you to action against that financial structure which is preventing the State Governments from tackling the many problems facing them. After all, under the present Constitution, it is we, the State Government, who are responsible to tackle the various problems connected with food, mass unemployment and the various nation-building activities for the benefit of our people. If the Constitution does not give us the wherewithal to take up all the schemes for the benefit of the people, I want to know where democracy is. Can we call it democracy if the Constitution charges you with the responsibility of taking up these schemes, but at the same time it does not provide you with the necessary wherewithal and resources? If this is the sort of Constitution under which you do not get the resources by means of which you can tackle the problems facing the Government, I would like to invite

13th March 1953] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

you to join us so that we can both fight together and get the Constitution changed and thus acquire power to solve the problems which we are called upon to solve. So long as you do not do that, our charge against you will continue."

**MR. SPEAKER:**—"Let the hon. Member say, 'Government' and not 'you' as 'you' refers to the Chair."

**\* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:**—"It is not a personal 'you', Sir, it is an impersonal 'you'. Therefore, my charge against the Congress party, the Ministerialist party and the Government is that by pleading their inability to do certain things, they are only screening the facts, concealing the facts. It is not real democracy. By merely sending a few representatives to the State Assemblies and Parliament we cannot be said to have real democracy, unless it is accompanied by a recognition of our right to have all the resources necessary for tackling the various problems. Let me not dilate on this point too much.

"Let us see what this Government have done during the last nine months. We are told that the Government have spent about Rs. 7 or 7½ crores on famine relief. Probably, when the Finance Minister makes his budget speech, he will disclose that Rs. 10 crores was spent. Is this amount adequate to solve an acute and colossal problem? We have to address ourselves to the simple question, whether this sum of Rs. 10 crores will be enough to meet the terrible famine prevalent in many parts of the State. (Interruption.) Mr. Muthiah Chettiar might have referred to this point. But he did not tell us where to get this money from. We know the sources that could very well be tapped. During the last nine months, famine has spread from district to district, unemployment has spread from one district to another. In the last five or six months many of the workers have been rendered unemployed. Hundreds of thousands of workers in Coimbatore, Madurai and other industrial centres are to-day having work only for three days in a week. From 1st March, the position has further deteriorated. Their wages have been reduced. Production has fallen. What are the steps that Government have taken to arrest these? After all, we will be told that these are natural things, that Nature has been unkind to us for the last four or five years and that our hydro-electric projects are not able to supply enough power for development of industries. It is true that electric power has not been properly supplied for the last five years. But what have the Government done to see that hydro-electric power is augmented by installing thermal stations? Is there any prospect at all of the Government undertaking some more projects? Are we sure that at the end of next year or the year after next, Nature is going to be more kind to us? There is not going to be enough electricity supplied to industries. In spite of the fact that trade unions in this State, Employers' Associations in this State and industrialists also have been asking again and again that thermal stations have to be put up in large numbers if production is to be maintained and

11  
a.m.



[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [13th March 1953]

unemployment averted, the Government have taken no steps whatsoever in this direction. Much is made of the Bokara Dam recently opened by Pandit Nehru in Bihar. In a project, advertised for things as flood control, and irrigation, this thermal scheme has had priority. Why? Not that there is urgent need for power there, but the jute bosses, the coal bosses, the British bosses and other industrialists want cheaper electricity. Then it is possible to give priority to the Damodar Valley project of which Pandit Nehru is so very fond."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"What has the Damodar Valley scheme to do with the subject? My objection is to the scope of your speech."

\* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I would explain how it is relevant. The Government of India have a five-year plan of which much is made. When you are able to build a thermal station in Bokara why is it that priority should not be given to a thermal project in Madras where industries are suffering and factories are closing down year after year? Why is it that the Government of Madras do not press upon the Government of India the need for giving top priority to thermal projects here? Why is it that one is built at Bokara where there is absolutely no need for it to-day? It is not as if jute mills will close down if there were no thermal stations there; it is not as if coal mines will stop working. These could certainly run for some more time on coal without the new project. Why is it still that that thermal station was constructed? Because it is absolutely necessary to please the British bosses our industrialists can suffer; our workers can suffer. This seems to be the mentality of the Government."

"How is it that the food problem is tackled? I am glad that in the Governor's Address they have not made the claim that they are solving the food problem through the policy they are now pursuing or that the food situation has improved. No such claim is made in it. What exactly is the situation on the food front? What is the policy the Government are following with regard to it? The five-year plan is being bandied about."

RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIAR OF CHETTINAD:—"What is your plan?"

\* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Of course we have a plan but it does not receive publicity. That is the democracy under which we are functioning. The planners have also given us a method of solving the food problem, a wonderful method indeed. It is said that the net absorption of imports for the last six years works out on an average to three million tons. It goes on: 'While it is not possible to estimate the "deficit" directly in terms of food production and requirements, this net absorption of imports is indicative of the measure of deficiency that has to be made good. In the nature of things, the "deficit" is not an invariable factor. If food prices are allowed to rise, the consumption of some sections of the population would come down for want

13th March 1953] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

of sufficient purchasing power to buy food at these prices? This is the way suggested in the plan for solving the food problem. If food prices are allowed to soar the poorer sections of the people, for want of purchasing power, will not be able to buy their food requirements. Then the Government will not have the responsibility of feeding them. This is the wonderful way in which the planners seek to solve the food problem. Our Government have taken recourse to this method of reducing the food deficit. Raise the food prices and make food unavailable to the ordinary man. Make it impossible for him to buy. Then the whole question is solved. To-day in the Government godowns there is enough stock of rice. But what is the price, the fair price? It is fifteen annas per measure. At the time when food was decontrolled, Pandit Nehru told us that food prices were not going to be allowed to rise beyond ten per cent of the controlled price. But what is the fair price of rice to-day? It has come to fifteen annas. We do not know what is going to happen to-morrow. What is it that we find in the Governor's Address about this question? It is said wheat and millets will be sold at cheaper prices. Probably it will be fourteen annas and eleven pies, and this is what is termed cheaper."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"It will be sold at ten annas."

\* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"We know that the wheat prices are going up. The International Wheat Marketing Board in the United States with whom talks are going on . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Why do you wish for a rise?"

\* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I am not wishing. You might have agreed to pay more to the American bosses. Recently we were told that instead of one dollar and eighty cents being paid to them as per the agreement entered into in the last three years, the wheat exporting countries led by the United States of America were demanding, even though there is a bumper harvest this time, two dollars and twenty cents. It is also said that it is not possible to cut own the price. That is the statement made by the Government of India in Parliament. In the light of that statement the price of wheat is going to rise. Therefore, by raising prices and making food unavailable to the ordinary man, you are going to solve the problem of food."

"The plan mentions about certain basic principles for dealing with this problem. It says:

'The Bengal Famine Commission reviewed in detail the long-term trends in the economy as well as the several short-term factors which culminated in the food crisis of 1943. The report of that Commission enunciated the principle that "food for all" must be accepted as the basis for Government policy in this field.'

"My complaint is that this Government have refused to accept this principle. When we say that, the Government come and say



[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [13th March 1953]

production has to be increased. It is to be increased. But how is it to be increased? That is the question we have to face. Have we tried to observe these principles which the plan has enunciated? The planners say that unless social conditions change, production cannot be increased by mere technical changes. I would ask the Government of Madras what change in social relationship they contemplate in this State. Do the Government, after nine months of their existence, come forward with a measure which will change certain of our fundamental social conditions in our country?

11-10  
a.m. Are we trying to do it? After tremendous agitation it was possible for us to get the Tanjore Ordinance. It is after all a small thing. It did not fundamentally change the social relations. It only gave a small increase in the share of the produce to the peasants. In Chidambaram which is adjacent to Tanjore peasants demand nothing more than that. They ask: 'Give us some measure which will give us the same share in the produce'. What is the policy that the Government pursue there? Are they trying to go to the help of the peasants and settle the situation there? No. On the other hand the Police battalion is sent there. Fifty Harijan kisans have been arrested. Women were beaten. This is what has happened at Chidambaram about which Swami Sahajanandam who represents that constituency spoke the other day. Is that the way the Government are going to solve the social problem? If the Government are not going to address themselves to the fundamental social problems, how are we to expect that at the end of this year or at the end of next year our country is going to improve?

"It is no good merely to say that our ills are due to the failure of rains. If that were so there need not have been a change in the Government. The British Government might have continued to remain here. After all the British Government instituted certain social relationships and the Congress itself has accepted right from the very beginning that these social institutions and relationships were a hindrance to our progress. It was said that they were hindrances to the development of the productive forces in our country. With them, in fact, it was not possible to solve the problem of unemployment and so on. That was why Congress itself demanded a change. To-day we are being regaled with the story that nothing is wrong with the country. The only thing that is wrong with the State is the fact that Nature has been unkind to us. If only it had been kind there would be no food problem, no unemployment problem, nothing. Why is the party in power trying to go back on every tenet that it preached when it was in opposition. That is the straightforward question that I would ask Rajaji to answer. Of course he might say, 'There was a time when the slogans were useful. They might have been good at that time but to-day we are in office. What we told the people at that time need not be taken into consideration to-day. We have to give up all slogans now.' They were necessary to rouse the people. They are considered as outmoded now when they are in office and when they are faced with the question of implementing

13th March 1953] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

the slogans. But I want to ask: has the fundamental social relationship changed? How then do these slogans become outmoded when there is no change in the social relationship? What are the new things that have happened to make the slogans outmoded?

“ Take the question of remission of kist. What have the Government done? They say remission has been granted, kist collections have been postponed. Very good. But merely by postponing the kist collections are we going to help the peasants? When you postpone the kist collections, what does that mean? The rains have failed. The crops have failed. The peasants have no money with them. By postponing the collection of kist by two, three or even six months the peasants are not going to get money. In the meanwhile what is to happen to the terrible load of debt under which the peasants are suffering. If they are not in a position to pay kist, naturally they will not be in a position to pay the debts, which are due to money-lenders. We know that our peasants are terribly debt-ridden. Mr. B. V. Narayana-swami Naidu in his report which was published after the war, taking into account the development during the five-year war period, has pointed out that the debt load on the poorer sections of the agriculturists—not the landlords—has tremendously increased. That being so what is it that we are going to do to prevent the land being taken away from the poor peasants, to see that the distress warrants are not there? Is it not our business to protect the peasants? Why should not the Government come forward with a measure for the postponement of collection of these debts, why not declare a moratorium on these debts? I do not ask that these debts should be wiped out. This Government is not capable of doing it. But why not declare a moratorium? Government brought a moratorium Bill in 1937. Have the conditions of the peasants improved now? No. The conditions have worsened. That being so why not come forward with another moratorium Bill so that the peasants are saved at least the lands? For this question affecting the peasantry, the Government have no answer, the Governor's Address has not given any answer.

“ In vast areas of our State peasants grow commercial crops, like cotton, tobacco, sugarcane and groundnut. What is their plight for the last one year? Let me quote from the figures given by Mr. Deshmukh. The index numbers of wholesale prices of industrial raw materials which stood at 688 in June 1951 began steadily falling and came down to 580 by January 1952 and then followed the February-March slump when they came down to 424 in March 1952. In December 1952, they stood at 421. In other words the fall in prices of industrial raw material was 39 per cent from the prices of May 1951, and about 27½ per cent from the January 1952 prices. These are the index figures of prices. We know this is not the price at which the peasants are able to sell their produce. There are many intermediaries and the peasants are mulcted by these intermediaries. That means that the peasants are able to sell their produce such as groundnut, sugarcane, cotton, etc., at about 50 per cent less price than what they got in



[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [13th March 1953]

1951. What does this mean? It means that the big industrialists and foreigners who were taking these raw materials were able to get them at about 39 per cent less than what they were paying for them in 1951 and 27½ per cent less than what they were paying in January 1952.

“On the other hand, take the prices of the manufactured goods. The prices of these have not fallen by 39 per cent or 27½ per cent; they have not fallen even by 10 per cent during this entire period. I will give figures. The index of wholesale prices of manufactured articles stood at 405·6 in January 1952, and came down to 400·9 in June 1952. In December 1952, it stood at 367·6. That means to say that there has been a fall of only about 8 per cent in the case of manufactured goods. There was a sudden fall in February-March and then it remained there more or less stationary. All this means that our peasants do not get a proper price for their produce, rather they are forced to sell their produce at lower prices, but they are not able to get the manufactured articles at reasonable prices.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“Wages have not come down.”

\* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“I would like to point out that the index figures of manufactured articles prepared by the Economic Adviser to the Government of India take into account not only the prices of articles manufactured in India. They take into account the prices of articles which are manufactured in factories and which are sold in this country whether they are of indigenous manufacture or of foreign manufacture. It only means that our peasants could purchase their needs only at 9 per cent less.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“What is the wage factor? Have the wages fallen to that extent?”

11 20 a.m. \* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“What is the position of the industrial working classes? Have their wages increased or fallen down. We know actually there has been no increase in their wages. Has there not been a big rise in the cost of living index? As a matter of fact we know that the working classes are not compensated fully. The Government and the industrialists have never accepted the basic principle that the working classes have got to be compensated fully for the rise in the cost of living. Let us take the simple question of bonus. During the last two years, the bulk of the industrial working classes have not been paid their customary bonus they were getting before. The Coimbatore mill-owners refused to pay the bonus due from 1948 in spite of the fact that they made enormous profits during all these years. All people talk of crisis. Even during the period 1932-34, the country faced a crisis and they did not make much profits, the net profits ranging from 2 to 6 per cent only. Some mills did not get any profits at all and they had to forego the depreciation appropriation. To-day also they talk of crisis. Take the case of big industrialists. The Harveys, the Binnys and other big mills are

13th March 1953] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

making huge profits. The Harvey Mills made a profit of Rs. 45;0 lakhs and declared a dividend of 20 per cent and they had to carry over a part of their profits for the next year. That is the position so far as the textile mills are concerned. If the sugar industry is not making any profits, the Government give a subsidy of Rs. 4;5 crores so that the sugar magnates can earn profits. All these industries are making huge profits all these years. But as far as the common people are concerned, the Government will say: 'Well, you have got to suffer; the crisis is there.' In spite of the fact that there is a crisis, all these industries have been making huge profits. They have made maximum profits, not six per cent. After all, in 1946, when Sri Rajagopalachariar, I believe, was also in the Central Government, there was a Tripartite Conference in which we were asked to wait for three years saying that, if we did not strike for three years, the production would increase. They also told us that they would control and see that the employers did not indulge in malpractices. That was the famous industrial truce resolution. At first they made a provision in the Industries Control Bill limiting the profits to six per cent. But to-day have they done it? On the other hand, is it or is it not a fact that in our own State huge profits ranging from 30 to 50 per cent are made by the big industrialists? For them there is no crisis. But there is crisis as far as the workers are concerned.

"Sir, take the case of the handloom weaver. After ten months, the problem of the handloom weaver is still what it was before. The Government tell us that the problem of the handloom weaver is that yarn must be made available at prices at which they are made available to the composite mills. It is good as far as it goes. But we say that yarn has got to be made available, not at the prices at which it is made available to the composite mills, but at a lower price. The Government give subsidies to the sugar magnates, and the jute magnates and help the mill-owners by reducing the export duty on cloth from 25 per cent to 10 per cent. When they can do that, why should not they come forward and help the handloom weaver by subsidising and reducing the prices of yarn that is supplied to him? They say they are interested in the handloom industry and in solving unemployment. If so, the Government of Madras have got to press on the Government of India to make yarn available to the handloom weaver at a reasonable price. The question is not mill versus handloom? Let us also understand what really the situation is. It is not as though our country is suffering from excess production of cloth. To-day we are manufacturing about 4,600 million yards of cloth to clothe our 367 million people according to the census of 1951 and it must have gone up by now. Before the war, the per capita consumption of cloth was 16 yards on the standards that were obtaining in the days of British rule and on the whole we needed about 5,600 million yards both handloom and mill. To-day are we consuming that amount of cloth? Out of the 4,600 million yards of mill cloth, about 650 million yards are being exported and the per capita consumption comes to about hardly 9 yards. Even that, our



[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [13th March 1953]

people are not able to purchase. It is not a question of competition between handloom cloth and mill cloth; it is not as though our mills are manufacturing so much of cloth that to-day there is going to be a competition between the mill industry and the handloom industry. Our people stand in need of cloth; to-day they are not in a position to purchase their requirements of cloth. How can the Government make the people purchase cloth? They must devise measures by means of which cloth can be cheapened and made available to the people. Otherwise this cannot be solved. There is no use of beating about the bush. Unless we increase their purchasing power, we cannot solve the problem of poverty of our people.

"Sir, what is it we are promising to the people in the Five-Year Plan? It does not give us any hope. We were told the other day by the Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam that his concept of democracy is right and that our concept of democracy is all wrong. I am not going to speak about that aspect now. It is said that the Five-Year Plan is a democratic plan in which our people are fully associated. It is such a democratic plan that nobody knows what the Five-Year Plan is; it is such a democratic plan that the Government of India have not even cared to publish this Five-Year Plan in full; they have just published only a summary of it. We, as the Legislators of this State, do not know what the Five-Year Plan is in so far as it affects our own State. The State Government has not even supplied us the details of the Five-Year Plan. This is the wonderful democracy under which we are living to-day. Therefore, Sir, I say that unless these basic and fundamental problems are tackled, there is not going to be any change at all.

"There is the issue of the Andhra State. The Communist Party has taken up a certain stand in respect of the City of Madras. It so happens that the view of the Tamil Nad Congress Party as also that of Sri C. Rajagopalachariar coincides with that. Mr. Rajagopalachari comes forward and says that whatever may be the objections of the Communist Party in regard to other matters, their stand so far as the Madras City is concerned is a correct one. I am very sorry to say that he is looking at things with a coloured vision. He is looking at things from the point of view of a trickster. There are certain ordinary fundamental principles, by which the Communist Party comes to conclusions. But Mr. Rajagopalachari cannot conceive of such things. Therefore it is he now says that whatever may be the objectives of the Communist Party its stand is correct. On the other hand, let me now say that we never speak with two voices. It is only the Tamil Nad Congress Party and the Andhra Congress Party who put forward different views. The Tamil Nad Congress Party put forward their view from Madras, the Andhra Congress Party theirs from Andhra—all echoing at the same time that they are fighting for the unity of India. Each Congress Party puts forward its own view. The Kerala and the Maharashtra Congress Parties have their own viewpoints. Even in Bengal, we find the Bengal Congress Party putting forward certain claims with regard to certain areas in Bihar.

13th March 1953] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

“On the other hand what do we do? What does the Communist Party do? Is it changing its views every now and then? No, surely not. We stand on certain principles and we will never deviate from them. We stand by our people. We are ready to face the people. It is because we have firm faith in our people that we say openly that we will face them at any moment. The Communist Party's stand on the question of cities is one that has long been known. As far back as 1946, both the Tamil and Andhra Committees of the Communist Party of India issued a joint statement wherein the stand taken by the Communists with regard to cities was affirmed. We stand by that even to this day. Therefore it is not correct to say that either the Andhra Communists or the Tamil Communists are not in favour of Madras City being the temporary capital of Andhra only in recent times. This is absolutely untrue. Even earlier than 1946 (I think it was as early as 1937) when the question of linguistic provinces was still in a nebulous state, the then illegal Communist Party came out with the declaration in the name of the Congress Socialist Party that Madras cannot be the capital of Andhra. The Communist Party stands by its principles. It judges each issue on its relative merits. It is only in the Congress Party that we find them not sticking to any definite principle. It is the policy of the Congress to allow one people to fight against another, viz., the Andhras to fight the Tamils, the Kerala people to fight the Tamils and the Maharashtrians to fight the Gujarathis and so on. But we, the Communists, stand by the stand that we had taken long ago. We stand for the people, for democracy.”

AN HON. MEMBER:—“Yes, yes, for making people fight one another.”

\* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“Now let me refer to our previous resolution in regard to cities. It is not with reference to Madras only but to cities like Bombay, Hyderabad and others. We say that the demand that these cities should be formed into Chief Commissioners States is a negation of democracy. We judge the whole question on the basis of principles. Is it democracy that a far more advanced city like Madras should be constituted into a ‘C’ class State and be ruled by a Chief Commissioner? Are we to subject ourselves to such a state of affairs? That is why we say that such a proposal is nothing but a negation of democracy. Nor is such a step going to help the economic, political or cultural development of those areas which form their natural hinterlands. Then what is the criterion to be adopted while deciding the question of linguistic States? The main criterion to which we, the Communists, attach much importance is the people living in those areas and the surrounding areas. It is only with reference to the people that we have to decide the issue. Can it be otherwise? Can Bombay which is surrounded by Maharashtra and Gujarati people be made a Tamil State? Nor can Hyderabad be made a Maharashtra State or Kerala a Telugu State? This is sheer folly. May be, to Mr. Rajagopalachari it may appear to



[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[13th March 1953]

be a tribal idea. To-day he talks in that vein. I am not surprised at it because that view is what the Congress has taken from the British administration. After all, what did the British administration do? They constituted the different States. Did they do so taking into account the wishes of the people living in those areas? No, surely not. They did it for their own administrative convenience. When Mr. Rajagopalachari thinks that what all the British administration had done in this country is sacrosanct, then it is no wonder that he says now that the formation of linguistic States is a tribal idea. The same state of affairs obtaining at the time the Britisher left continues even to this day. After all with what intention did the British Government carve out our States? It is not with a spirit of democracy but with a spirit of making one people fight against the other in a State full of different races. Their entire policy has been designed to make the Andhras fight the Tamils, and the Kannadigas the Maharashtrians. The same is being now continued by the Congress also. It is no wonder.

“ Well, what exactly is behind the demand for linguistic states? It is a modern idea. It is not a tribal idea. When a majority of the people in a particular State do not know the language of the administration, it is but natural that they demand their own State wherein the language of the administration is the language of the people. But what is happening now? The majority of our people do not know English. For knowing what we speak in this House (we speak English) they have to seek the aid of a teacher or a lawyer. I am not criticising the lawyers as such. (Laughter.) When such is the state of affairs, it is but natural that they demand a State wherein they may fully participate in the affairs of the administration. After all their demand is quite justifiable. The Hon. Chief Minister stated that what we want is efficient administration. But how do we get that efficient administration? Good administrators can only be drawn from the people. How could it be done if the majority do not participate in the affairs of the State? The Chief Minister also stated that there must be good work. The Government carries on its work in a language and not in the air. Try to carry on the work in Marathi, Gujarathi or French and see how it will work. Let us realize that language is an important aspect of Government administration. How then can we say that the idea of a linguistic State is a tribal idea?

“ Therefore I say that the demand for the formation of linguistic states is a modern idea and it is one that should be conceded. Let us not talk as Mr. Varadarajulu Nayudu did of declaring martial law and putting down the just demand for linguistic states. That is not the way of uniting the people. Unity of India cannot be got by force. If it is after all a tribal idea, I would ask one question of the Chief Minister. Why should the Tamil people, especially Congressmen from Tamil Nad, be so much insistent that the Madras City should not go to the Andhras? What does it matter if Madras goes to Andhra or to Maharashtra?

13th March 1953] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

What we want is good administration. After all, the urge for the formation of a Tamil State is in every Congressman, whether he would accept it or not--and that is a fact. Therefore, just to dub these things as a tribal idea is not going to help any body. I was also very sorry that on the floor of this House certain statements were made by certain Members, especially by people on the side of the Government, which are not likely to help to create better relations between the people of Andhra and of Tamil Nad. I demand that we stand on the basis of principles. Let us not try to raise the question of the Tamils against the Andhras and Telugus against Tamils. This is not the way in which unity is going to be ensured. If there are certain forces, chauvinistic forces let loose in this House, let us not succumb to those forces. Let us rise above them and also try to fight those forces on the basis of justice, freedom and democracy. This is what I wanted to say on this subject.

"I have also got to say something about the Address delivered by the Governor, with regard to the police forces. The only credit that the Governor has taken in the entire Address is with regard to the fact that his Government have put down a revolt in the police force. I cannot understand the use of the term 'revolt' in this connexion. This is what he said 'Firm action had to be taken by Government in respect of a challenge to authority and discipline in the Police force in the City, that was attempted by certain of its members'. If this is the way in which the Government think they are going to create a contented and a loyal police force, I can only be sorry for the Government, and they will learn by experience. I know the Chief Minister will say 'You are trying to exploit the Police'. I know . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"How do you guess what I will say?"

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Knowing the Chief Minister as I do, I can foresee and read his mind."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"So easily and so correctly?"

\* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"He will also say, 'Well, these people had something to do with the policemen's strike'."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"You did not; but it will come later; there too it is only exploitation."

\* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I knew what you were going to say; I anticipated you. In the year 1946 also, the policemen refused to take their salaries—let us not forget it. Then it was not a strike of the police force. But is it not open to them even to express peaceful protests? As I said, in 1946 the police force in the City refused to take their salaries, and Mr. Prakasam gave them an increase in wages after they had made a number of representations. Government at first turned down their requests, and ultimately they refused to receive their salary. For the matter of that, even the jail warders refused to receive their salary on one



[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [13th March 1953]

occasion and some other Government servants also refused. But this is the only way in which they can show their protest and make the Government move. After all, let us not forget that the Chief Minister when he went and addressed the policemen, admitted that many of their grievances—not all of them but many of them—were just. The simple question that arises is this: whether what the Chief Minister could do after going and talking to them could not have been done earlier. Who was responsible for not doing it? I would like to know whether it is a fact that the representations made by the policemen were not even sent up to the Government but turned down by the police officers themselves? Or, if they had been actually sent up, why is it that the Government and the Chief Minister—who found many of their grievances just on the 6th or 7th January—I do not remember the date—did not see to it that these just demands were granted earlier, so that discontent might have been avoided? My contention is that this is not the way in which to deal with these problems. I think it was incumbent on the Government to have resolved the problem and removed the cause of discontent much earlier, and this is not the way in which to ensure the loyalty of the police force, and certainly not by putting them in jail. Surely, authority is not to be exercised that way at all.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ One more minute, please.”

\* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Finally, Sir, these nine months have seen all these events. We would all like to know how the Government are going to solve all these problems and what proposals they have in that respect. I know the Budget speech will be coming and we will have some kind of information. But even before that, I would like the Chief Minister to give us an indication as to how exactly he is going to solve these problems. The absence of a full and entire statement of policy in the Governor's address is unsatisfactory. The Governor's Address does not tackle any single problem facing our State, and therefore I say that the Motion of Thanks should be rejected on that ground.”

\* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very glad that much frank talking has been indulged in, although the scope of the talk was rather more than I had expected or would admit as relevant. Much of what the Leader of the Opposition—I am glad my friend occupies that position for it is advantageous to deal with realities and not with unrealities—much of the talk which the Leader of the Opposition gave us referred to matters which really cannot form scope for examination or action in this Assembly. It is possible, it is relevant—I do not say it is irrelevant or useless—to go into all those matters if the occasion permitted us to deal somewhat usefully with such matters. But all the circumstances referred to, in fact the whole of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, dealt with matters—except of course the last subject he referred to—which concern the Finance Minister of India, the Cabinet of the Government of India and the Opposition members in Parliament. It is a pity that the

[18th March 1953] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

Leader of the Opposition is not in Parliament; but he is represented ably by other Comrades of his there; and I have no doubt that even in that large House in Delhi and the confusing forces pulling in different directions, the party that is represented by the Leader of the Opposition here is fairly well-represented, and they have been making these points. They must all be dealt with there. For instance, it is not for him to deal with the Five-Year Plan here now; it has been accepted there, and it has to be executed here. I welcome it. But my friends opposite do not think much of it; they think it does not deal with realities and that the solutions are wrong. I quite appreciate the stand taken by them; because nothing that is amiss in this country can be corrected, in the opinion of the Leader of the Opposition and his Comrades here, unless the Government entirely changes from top to bottom and not only from top to bottom in the States but from top to bottom in Delhi also. It is perfectly consistent with the position they hold that the present speech should be made about the Five-Year Plan.

11-50  
a.m.

“References were made to famine, to prices, to the fall in the prices of certain products in the country, to the rise in prices of certain other products in the country. I do not know what magic the Leader of the Opposition will have when he becomes the Chief Minister of the Government here or the Prime Minister of the Government in Delhi, I do not know by what magic he will depress the prices in one set of commodities and raise prices in certain other set of commodities. If I am alive I will congratulate Mr. Ramamurthi if he succeeds in producing that very nice unbalance that our country wants—a rise in the price of commodities that we export like jute, cotton and other things and a fall in the price of rice that we eat in this country. I should certainly congratulate him. I confess straightaway that I am not a master in that art. I shall not be able to do that. Nor will the Finance Minister of Delhi refrain from making the confession that he cannot control and move the prices of certain articles in one direction and of certain other articles in another direction. It is not relevant and it is not possible for us to deal with the matter here.

“Then, Sir, he referred to many other matters which really fall entirely within the province of the Government of India. It is not even a Budget debate now. It is a debate on the Governor's Address with respect to this particular Session. The Governor is the mouth-piece of the Government. Some hon. Members imagine that the Governor speaks in his personal capacity when he addresses the House. At any rate, on that assumption they made remarks as to the style and the manner in which he should have delivered it. Some hon. Members even demanded that he should have made a more ‘soulstirring’ speech; he should have employed a different style and that he should have spoken in the same manner in which he spoke in some other places. Unfortunately the President's speech, or the Governor's speech, or the King's speech in England,—these are all of one ritual—represent the policy of the Government and the programme of the Government



[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [13th March 1953]

for the Legislature at that particular period. We should not really imagine that the Governor is making a speech of his own. It is a programme democratically presented to the Legislature as to what the Government has done or is going to do and what is relevant for that particular session is dealt with in that speech.

“ It is not possible for me to accept the advice of the Leader of the Opposition that I should stand up and fight the Government of India now and change the entire structure of the Government. I quite agree with him that the times are such, that the condition of India to-day is such, that the promises which the people expect us to perform in respect of the progress of the country are such, that the requirement of the times and conditions is a truly national Government of all people together aiming with one mind and speaking with one voice. I quite agree that that is in the hearts of many people—Members on this side as well as Members on the other side and people in the country also—all of them feel that this is not the time for us to divide in the manner we are divided and that we should really run through a certain number of years with a solid national Government, if I may use that term loosely. Unfortunately, that is not to be and it is not possible for me or for this Government or for Madras to stand up for such a thing. We cannot change things in that way. We could only wish, but if a number of people wish earnestly—I as an old-fashioned man feel that it will come. The wishes of the people of a country will be carried out, especially when those wishes are entirely in their own hands. The wishes are not concerned with other peoples' activities, but with our own. If really we people in India heartily and sincerely wish we should have no differences of parties, creeds and the like—not that we give them up, or that we change our permanent convictions, but for the time being the necessity of the hour requires that we act together—if we wish like that it will come one day, if not to-day. I do hope it will happen, but for that, a very great chastening of hearts is necessary.

“ My Friend, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Ramamurthi, waxed somewhat—I would not say, eloquent but vehement—about the faults in the Congress sections, that they are divided, that they speak with different voices and that they do not agree but quarrel in many matters, and that on the other hand the Communist party is solid and united. That claim was made once of the entire United Democratic Front, but that is all past history (laughter) and let me not twit people on that now. But the claim now is that of the Communist party. I grant that claim. It is not necessary for him to make such a vehement claim. The Communist party is of one mind, it speaks with one voice and I take my hat off—which I have not (laughter)—to them in that matter. It is true. I appeal to my Congress Friends to whatever territory they may belong to take a leaf from the book of the Communist party in that matter! The Congress is in responsibility and hence all the difficulties arise. The Communist Party men are not now responsible; they are now only responsible for being clever, for

13th March 1953] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

being united and for dealing strokes from the Opposition with effect. Their responsibility is only the responsibility of the Opposition and they are united. I compliment them on it and I do not at all modify my compliment in that respect. A small party has the advantage always of being united, and large parties are at a disadvantage. That is true. May I wish that the Communist party may always remain solid and united and small!" (Laughter.)

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I would have no quarrel if the Congress party were fighting among themselves on this question. Quarrels are bound to be, but my objection is that they are rousing one set of people against another. That is where my quarrel comes."

\* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"This modified attack is an unreal attack. It is clever. That again is all right and we need not deal with it. Now, my friends, the Communists have taken the correct position. The Leader of the Opposition was at great pains to show that his party's views are not new, that it is their old solid position and that they never swerved from it. It was not addressed to me, I think, but he addressed it to certain other people. I have no objection to that. I never uttered a word suspecting the ancient character of the decision or anything of the kind. But it is possible that it is necessary for Mr. Ramamurthi to have explained that position. It may serve his purpose. Who doubted that the Communist party is an all-India party, not a territorial party, not only that, but it is an international party. It is a party of the whole world and in certain ways it is an advantage because there is greater reason forthcoming when the whole world thinks about any matter. It is true, but at the same time there are dangers also in that, to which it is not necessary for me to refer now. I give the compliment fully that the Communist party is a united party and the Communist party is an international party. Unfortunately, the Congress is only an Indian party. Of course, the Congress has an international outlook but it cannot call itself an international party. Yet the time may come when they also may play a dominant role in international affairs. But to-day the Congress is an Indian party only and it believes in giving freedom to various sections which the Communist party may not believe in. Hence the divisions noticed in Congress circles.

"Coming to the linguistic question, it was very interesting for me to hear Mr. Ramamurthi dilate so much upon the virtues of linguistic provinces. May be, he is right, may be he is wrong. But I feel confident and I am certain in my mind that as India is constituted to-day, the requirements of the situation do not call for priority for this particular matter. I do not say that this position will be always wrong or always right. But to-day the priority call is for many other things and not for the division of India into linguistic provinces. There is no difficulty on account of not understanding one another's language. The faults

12  
noon.



[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [13th March 1953]

of our country do not depend upon want of knowledge, either internal or mutual or even absolute. Our country is full of understanding, full of mutual knowledge and full of knowledge in the abstract also. What we are wanting in is the desire to work hard and the knowledge that it is necessary to work hard to produce results. I am glad that Dr. K. B. Menon, who is another left-winger and another type of Socialist, has given support to my view with regard to the validity or the utility of dividing India into linguistic States now. I do not think it is good and I am glad that Dr. K. B. Menon also thinks so. If I may indulge in a personal reflection, I think Dr. K. B. Menon is as deep a thinker as Mr. Ramamurthi and therefore I have got to strike off one against the other on this issue of linguistic States. I do not think I shall be found fault with for making this personal remark.

“Many things have been referred to in the debate. Let me remind hon. Members of the fact that this is a debate on the Governor's Address and not a budget debate. But we have this system of re-duplication, I do not know how long it will last, of the Governor's Address being discussed first and the whole thing repeated again in the budget debate not even in the next session but immediately now. I am disinclined to enter now into the criticisms levelled against the administration. I say this so that there may not be any feeling that I have neglected those criticisms.

“Mr. Latchanna's strong tirade against some amending Bill which we are considering in connexion with the Estates Land Act has deeply impressed me. I cannot understand the Estates Abolition Act and I cannot understand even if I try. What has been done before my time about estates has led to a lot of complications and difficulties. Whatever may be the merits of the steps taken, people seem to differ. Mr. Latchanna is however very earnestly convinced that something that we are going to do is very wrong. I accept it, I meaning myself.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“Accept what?”

\* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“I accept that he is convinced that we are very wrong. The Government will look into the matter. I am clearly conscious of the fact that a matter of that kind should not be rushed through, when a majority of the people affected are in his area, and when that area is going to have democracy and self-government, it will be unfair to rush through the measure when its correctness is considered to be of doubtful validity. So I ask the Hon. Revenue Minister to consider the matter very carefully. If there is anything urgent, it must be done; if there is nothing urgent, it can visit. My Hon. Colleague will decide that. I assure Mr. Latchanna this much in that matter.

“Reference was made to the constabulary. I had intended not to refer to the subject at all because, as I said yesterday in

13th March 1953] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

another place, the less said about it in the popular assemblies, the better, because the constabulary serve a certain purpose and we should not try to make politics out of their performances or lapses. It is better we do not mix them up with legislative debates. I hold that view very strongly. But my friend Mr. Ramamurthi will not let me do the right thing in this matter. He has drawn the matter before us. He says that we did not treat them properly. I have no notion in my mind that Communists brought that crisis about. They did not. I do not give them that credit. But as soon as it came about, they pounced upon it saying 'Here is something which will serve our purpose'. I think it is a very wrong attitude. The old leaders of the Communist Party will not listen to what I say. But I call upon the young men of the Communist Party to listen to me for a moment. You (Communists) are trying to govern the country and not to be an eternal Opposition. I know that your Police will be much more under your discipline than my Police will ever be under me. I know you will govern with an iron hand. Let not the police constables imagine that they will be better off under a Communist Government. Let them not imagine that the present assistance they may get in the filing of writs or in other matters in connexion with it will stand for a long time. This Government will be much kinder and much more humane than a Communist Government will be. This Government will treat the constabulary sternly but generously. Now the Police will have to obey the Government. But when the Communist Party governs, the Police will have to obey the whole party, and every party member will be a dictator in his own region and within his own right. I am thankful to Mr. Ramamurthi for giving me this opportunity to make this indirect appeal to my constables not to fall into the trap. I said in the other House and I say again that the police constables are doing well. Let there be no misguidance from any quarter and they will fare well. My friend (Sri P. Ramamurthi) was referring to their grievances. About the dates, he was confused in his mind; I need not go into it. All matters which they represented before they set up this pay strike were being dealt with by the rightful authority that should deal with them, namely, the Police department. Later on when the matter came to my notice, not in the legitimate course but because of the pay strike, I immediately set it right. I told them this personally and to-day the matter stands corrected. But the things that happened later brought about the termination of their Association and certain rights which I gave to the Association as such have had to be suspended. So far as grievances go, they have all been set right. No doubt there is the general grievance in which the policemen also share, namely, that our country is poor, that we are poor and that we have to live an abstemious, unhappy and miserable life. But constables cannot get away from the rest of the people. What they suffer, the rest of the people also suffer. So far as things could be set right officially, it has been done. There is no difficulty whatsoever, and there is no doubt that the



[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [13th March 1953]

12-10  
p.m.

work of the constabulary will proceed well, until of course assistance or interference from my friends opposite breaks the charm. Things move by charm in this country as in many other countries. If we are loyal to one another, if we are considerate to one another and practise truth speaking, if we preserve our culture, it is all by a charm. It is easy to break the charm, but it is difficult to set right the consequences. I do hope that whatever the Communists may be doing in other respects, at least in respect of the constables and in respect of the army, they will not play their very able part in confusing issues and bringing about trouble. I do not think that they will let go any chance, and we will have to be very careful and give them no chance. That is the fact of the matter so far as the police constables are concerned. Let us forget the police constables with this.

“The main trend of the debate can be divided into two classes, so to say. One is ‘everything is bad and you could have done better; the administration could have done better; the Government could have done better’. I admit we could have done better and much better also. But we have tried to do our best. That is all my plea in respect of this matter. We have honestly tried to do our best in regard to the administration of the country during the period which is now debated and we shall continue to do our best so long as we are allowed to do it. The other point is ‘you cannot do it; unless everything is changed from top to bottom, you cannot do it’. That is, I think, what my lawyer friend from Ottapalam laid stress on. He said that unless everything was changed and the whole social order was changed, we could not be doing anything. That is the conviction and the creed, if I may say so, of the Members of the Opposition, and for that, there is no remedy just now. This Government believes . . . . .”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“That was your creed 15 years back.”

\* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“I agree. We believe, I believe, and any Government may be taken to believe, in change. But we do not believe in doing nothing till that change takes place. We believe that change is necessary. But we must be carrying on all the time. We believe also that the change cannot be sudden—it cannot be an upheaval, but it must be an organic and properly conducted change. That is the difference. I need not go into details now. We do propose to bring about change. But we do not propose to do things in a rash manner or in a wrong manner, simply because a change is necessary. With regard to the second aspect of the debate, namely, that everything should be changed, I need not say anything more. Let us, if possible, do it. But it is not possible to do it in one day.

“Sir, allegations were made by some hon. Members, I was not here throughout, and I had to depend on secondary evidence—that work on certain important matters had been stopped on

13th March 1953] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

account of the Andhra partition question. It is not right. No one deplores this partition interlude more than I do. At the same time, let me explain that anything that is urgent and necessary has not been stopped. What has been stopped are those matters where we felt honestly and after full consideration that the policy in respect of those matters should be left to the new Government that would come into being. In matters where very large sums of money are involved, it is not right for us to commit the Government one way or the other. It is only such matters that have been stopped. Even in cases where doubts existed, if the matter was urgent and necessary, we gave the benefit of the doubt to the urgency and not to the policy of leaving things to the new Government. Nobody need imagine that we have postponed things because of anger, irritation or annoyance or anything of that kind. That is not being done.

“ Sir, the main point is that we should deal with famine and the rise in prices. Is it enough merely to say that there is famine? I was waiting again for a remedy to be suggested by the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi. He has given the remedy, namely, ‘change the entire social order’. I grant that that can be a remedy. But I am fairly convinced that it cannot be applied just now, and it cannot be done. Even an entire change of the social order from top to bottom will not produce what we want. We may produce just distribution but that will not reduce the famine or the distress. Equal distribution is not enough. What we want is greater wealth. We cannot simply by just distribution give happiness to people. It may remove annoyance and injustice. But to give positive happiness, greater wealth must be produced. For that, efforts are being made. My colleagues in Delhi have produced a report—a plan. Nobody has found fault with it. Even the Members of the Opposition have not found great fault with it. We must go through it. In trying to implement it, we have to overcome a number of difficulties.

“ Much has been said from time to time about starvation deaths. I am only amused in a tragic way about these alleged starvation deaths. In the case of each starvation death reported to the Government, full and careful enquiries were made. In the vast majority of cases—I shall not say absolutely all—these allegations were found to be only false allegations, and there was nothing substantial. But I do not want to go into them. I would, however, put one question. These starvation deaths were reported ever since we took office, because we came in during the famine. Surely continual starvation deaths cannot be hidden. If it is one death, or two deaths, or twenty deaths, they could possibly be hidden. But if they indicated the general state of things in the country, surely what should we have had now after so many months since we took office? We should have had a toll of deaths all over the country—a terrible toll which nobody could possibly hide. Would it be necessary for the Opposition Members to dive into some death here or there, if really deaths were due to famine, and starvation consequent on that? Suppose there was



[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [13th March 1953]

cholera in some places, and I deny that there is cholera. We have only to wait for a few days, when cholera would spread, to see that there is cholera. Famine is worse than cholera. It is the hunger of the millions of people. If hon. Members really consider that that was the condition, since I took office, what should have been the position to-day? Thousands of deaths must have taken place. On the contrary, I am able and I am proud to claim on behalf of my Government that though we may have blundered here or done the right thing there, at least we have seen that there are no starvation deaths of that size or of that enormity. People have managed to live. Going round the countryside, we do not find what we should expect after so many months of starvation deaths. Even if deaths had been hidden away by some extraordinary means, the faces of the people should have shown them. In spite of famine, in spite of high prices, in spite of low purchasing power, error in distribution, and in spite of every defect, we have been able to see that people have not died of starvation and that things are going on well, and that on the whole, we have preserved normalcy in spite of famine and cyclone. For all these things, can I not claim some credit? Cannot the Members of the Opposition say one word of praise for all this? No. They still speak of starvation deaths. I submit, Sir, that the talk of starvation deaths must be given up once for all. It is too late hereafter to talk of these undisclosed starvation deaths. If they were going on, they should have accumulated to such an extent by now that no talk would be necessary and no proof would be necessary. Let us not waste any more time upon getting *post-mortem* examinations on some alleged deaths due to hunger. Photographs in some of our new journals have appeared to prove starvation. I imagine that in these days of make-ups and in these days of film production, photographs can be produced to prove anything. I attach no importance to such photographs, and to such newspapers. I can make a boy lie down on the pavement and say 'here is the condition of Madras. This boy is dying of starvation'. It is quite easy to produce such photographs. Starvation death is not a thing to be proved in that way. Famine Codes laid down a hint to watch deaths as a warning to officials. When such deaths take place, officials were asked to take note of them and make reports about them so that famine relief work should be started. But to-day that is not the way in which famine relief is given. These allegations are made to make out that the Government are grossly neglecting their duty towards the people. I hope that these starvation deaths will not figure again in attacks. It is meaningless after so long a period. I hope that to discredit the Government nobody will pray—I believe in the efficacy of prayer—for famine. I hope the Opposition Members—they do not believe in prayer—will not go on wishing for deaths, famine and difficulties in order to use them as points against the Government, because it is the people that will suffer if their wishes should be granted. I hope that the starvation and miseries that the Opposition may for political reasons be wishing for, will not take place.

13th March 1953] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

“Then, Sir, it is not possible for me to close without referring to the Andhra State question, at least briefly. I dealt with it in the other House yesterday, though I had not intended to deal with it there. I had intended to deal with it here, but it now seems to have become unnecessary. On the whole, I must be grateful to the Members of the House for having dealt with that subject in a spirit of moderation and in a spirit of goodwill. It has not been taken to any level of irritation or annoyance in this House. I am very grateful to the House in that respect. Over and above that, I must explain one thing. The reason why I am so clearly of opinion and in agreement with the Communist Party that the temporary capital or any kind of capital of the Andhra State should not be in Madras is a commonsense feeling. If people quarrel and when the quarrel is fresh and hot, that is not the time to put a further strain on feelings. The time may come later when we may put such a strain and such a test. But, at the time when the quarrel is fresh and hot and remembering the context in which things have taken place, it is not desirable, in my opinion, I would have given the same opinion if I had been an Andhra citizen. I would have given the same opinion. I am giving the same opinion though I am a Tamilian. It does not depend upon the group to which I belong. It is merely commonsense advice, the commonsense opinion that I hold, in regard to that matter. All sorts of talks and rumours are set afloat and the atmosphere is so fouled that daily when I open a paper, I see new falsehoods spread out. The other day I read, ‘Rajaji is responsible for writing the Wanchoo Report. He dictated the Wanchoo Report and it was typed by his typist.’ Does it appeal to any man with a grain of commonsense that I could have dictated and written the Wanchoo Report? Not only that. It is also said that my own Personal Assistant typed the Wanchoo Report. This is printed in a newspaper published in Madras and which wanted Madras to be made the temporary capital of the Andhra State. ‘Fantastic nonsense’, a phrase which the Prime Minister generally uses to describe such thing I must also use in this connexion.”

**SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:**—“What is the name of the paper?”

**\* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:**—“I should not like to name the paper.”

“Then, somebody else wrote to me—I am only describing to hon. Members the unfortunate position that I am in—and asked me, ‘Is it or is it not true . . . ?’ He is not an unimportant friend; he is an ancient, important supporter of my own old friend, Sri Prakasam, and I know him very well; he is a very senior old gentlemen, older than myself. He asked, ‘Is it or is it not true that you said and communicated to Pandit Nehru that Sri Potti Sriramulu was not really fasting and that it was all a fake?’ It is absolute falsehood. People seem to believe all sorts of things in their excitement.”



[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [13th March 1953]

"Then, somebody else had recently written in another important paper, not to be named, that the Madras Government had recommended that Tirupati should be handed over to the Central Government and C.R. . . ."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"Has any of your Ministers written like that?"

\* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Do not mix up things and create confusion. I am not a police constable. Let me tell you facts. It was solemnly stated that the Madras Government and C.R. had recommended that Tirupati should be handed over to the Central Government. The Madras Government have made no such recommendation. It is false. They have not considered it, and even if they asked me, I would not have recommended that. There has been no policy or recommendation of that kind. Probably it reflects what they themselves are fearing. I have no doubt that these and other fears may be worrying my friends on the other side, but why should we allow this fear to create false charges? If one has a fear, let the fear be kept to oneself. Why should you allow false imputations to be made against a man like me? I have made no suggestion to transfer Tirupati to Bengal or to the Central Government. The question is not whether such a proposal is good or bad; the contention is that I have been doing all this. The poison of the thing is in the imputation that I am suggesting these things. It is totally wrong and unfair.

"Well, I won't multiply the statements that are being wrongly made. I admit that I strongly advised against the temporary accommodation of the Andhra capital in Madras and let me tell hon. Members that I am quite aware of the misunderstandings that this position is likely to lead to and has been leading to. It is easy to consider that I am very harsh and ungenerous, asking people to get away overnight outside Madras. It is possible for people to misunderstand me as ungenerous, harsh, partisan and all that. Yet, I have been advising this. Because even now the claim to the City of Madras is not given up. Whether the claim is that it should be handed over to Andhra, or that it should be partially handed over to Andhra, or that it should not be handed over to one or the other but that it should be made a separate Chief Commissioner's Province; these claims have not been given up. They were and are strongly pressed. That is the reason for my attitude on this question. Not only were these claims strongly pressed before, but they have been continually persisted in and are not given up even to-day. Let me refer hon. Members to what Dr. Lanka Sundaram said just the other day. He issued a statement as I was returning from Delhi. As I was returning from Delhi, I read that statement which he had issued on the 9th and which appeared in the papers on the 10th. There are two things in that statement, one of which is, 'I must say that anything done to upset the findings of judicial enquiry would create in Andhra Desh a situation analogous to what obtained

13th March 1953] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

after the passing away of Mr. Potti Sriramulu.' Sir, as I was returning from Delhi, I read this statement. What is the meaning of it? It is not merely a panicky statement as some people wish to call it, it is an incitement to disorder. It is an incitement to what happened after Mr. Potti Sriramulu's death. Sir, when the claims for the temporary installation of the Andhra capital here had been thought to have weakened, this statement was issued in order to get people to be busy about it. And the particular form in which Dr. Lanka Sundaram says they should get busy about it is this: 'Anything done to upset the findings of judicial enquiry'—whatever that phrase may mean, it may mean the recommendation in the Wanchoo Report—'would create in Andhra Desh a situation analogous to what obtained after the passing away of Mr. Potti Sriramulu'. He might have said and frankly said, 'to loot'. But that is the meaning of it. It is not mere folly. It is gravely mischievous. It is very wrong and no one should encourage that kind of action. Whatever may happen, we do not want these things to happen again. Whatever may be the policy or decision, we do not want the new State to start in this manner and get lost. If it starts in this manner, it will not remain where it starts. It may create a most difficult situation.

"Let us go to the next statement made by him. He said, 12-30  
'The unalterable Andhra demand is that Madras City should p.m.  
be declared a centrally administered area and be the joint capital of the Andhra and Tamils'. He says that it is the 'unalterable Andhra demand'. How can one with commonsense agree to the proposal of temporary location of the capital here under these circumstances? Dr. Lanka Sundaram is a Member of Parliament. He is also a very important man there, or at least everybody thinks he is important. (Laughter.) The claim does not stop with him. There is Sri Prakasam and his Council of Action. Sri Prakasam is not a negligible man and we cannot overlook his views or his activities. His Action Council met recently, about the middle of February. It decided to organise a counter-agitation, in every division of the City by enrolling large numbers of students and other citizens and to make them work in the various divisions of the City. All these may not happen, but yet it is complete evidence of the attitude of Sri Prakasam and his Council of Action. Can we ignore all these things? Would I be considered doing the right thing if I said that Sri Prakasam is not an important man? Can I say like that aloud in Andhra? It would be wrong in my own conscience. Sri Prakasam is not an unimportant person, but is as important as I am. He does not happen to be the Chief Minister, that is all. But it is easy for him to become one. If only he took my advice, he could become the Chief Minister of the Andhra State to-morrow without any difficulty. But unfortunately he has taken a line which is natural, because he does not belong in that sense to the Andhra area only. He is an old colleague of mine and he really belongs to Madras. He should have been a member of my present Cabinet. Even after separation of Andhra there will be men in Madras like Sri Alladi Krishnaswamy Iyer, who speaks Telugu. Is he an Andhra in the new



[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [13th March 1953]

sense? No. His family is here, his property is here, his practice is here. So he would also like the Andhra High Court to be here." (Laughter.)

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD:—"What is his opinion about the capital?"

\* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"His opinion is not important in this matter. He is not a politician, thank God. (Laughter.) May he ever remain a non-politician, a good lawyer, a good friend and a generous-hearted man! May he not dabble in politics. (Laughter.)

"Even in yesterday's paper it is reported that Sri Prakasam has asserted in a meeting at Kakinada that, 'No right-thinking person can deny the claim of the Andhras to the City of Madras'. This statement has been made by him so recently. These statements are perhaps intended to convince me and the Government of India that the temporary capital of the Andhra State should be located in the City. I ask, 'Is this the way to do it?' Let us open and read any book on Tenancy. If a tenant by any method or to any extent denied the title of the owner, then the owner has every right to evict him. When they are claiming to be here as guests, the position is much worse. If the tenant denied the title of the owner, it is not tolerated. That being so, what would be the position of a guest disputing the title of his host? Yet on 10th March, Sri Prakasam is reported to have made the statement that I have just now referred to. These are some of the difficulties. I do not say that a man cannot and has no right to express his opinion. But the difficulties created by such an expression of opinion prompt me to hold and express firmly the opinion that it is undesirable from every point of view to try this experiment now. If I lived for another 20 years, I would have no objection to advise my Tamil friends then to invite the Andhras to come back to Madras when things would have calmed down. We want our City to become rich. We want trade and business to flourish here. Who wants Madras to become poor? We shall invite the Andhras to come back to the City when this passing phase of ill-will, suffering and bickering is over. But the Andhras will not come then. Mr. Nagi Reddi will then be in full possession and will advise them not to go back to Madras.

"I would advise my Andhra friends not to entertain any unreasonable fears. Yesterday, Dr. Lakshmanaswamy Mudaliar made the position very clear and I endorse every word of what he said in this connexion."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"He made the position worse."

\* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"It may be so according to you. But when I say that I endorse every word of his statement, it is with regard to admission to schools, colleges, hospitals and other institutions. We have never denied outsiders

13th March 1953] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

a proper place and we are not going to deny hereafter. It is not in our genius. That is why I said that I confirm all that was said by Dr. Mudaliar in this respect. These things are not generally written down as in an Attorney's or Solicitor's document. It will be sufficient if I say that we have not denied facilities to outsiders before and we shall not do it hereafter.

Some people are under an illusion that it is the capital that counts. The fact that a particular place is the capital does not count at all. In spite of partition and an Andhra capital elsewhere, Madras will continue to be the common market for all commodities that come here and go from here. Some people have a vague delusion that as soon as the Andhra State is separated my Finance Minister will confiscate all Andhra property and all Andhra trade in Madras. This is an entirely wrong feeling. No such thing can happen. No doubt, the fact of a particular place being the capital contributed to the growth of that city. If a capital for Andhra is started in another place, it will soon become an important place. Trade will flourish there and people will flock there. Sir, one of the reasons put forth for the temporary location of the capital in Madras is that there is no accommodation available in the Andhra area. The housing programme of the Madras Government may be slow and the housing programme of the Government of India may also be slow. But if and when the Andhra capital is opened in some place, I know that all the secreted money of many of the Andhra gentlemen will flow there and be put into the building of houses in order to secure big rents. I have no doubt whatsoever that a number of houses and hotels will spring up as soon as the capital is started. If only the Andhras permitted, the Tamils will start hotels there. But it may not be permitted and it may not also be encouraged by us here." (Laughter.)

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"It requires no permission."

\* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Gopalakrishniah is an innocent man, though he is a Communist. (Laughter.) He does not know that there are hundred ways by which a man can be prevented."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"I object to it."

\* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I say that he is an innocent man and a Communist" (Laughter).

AN HON. MEMBER:—"He is not a Communist."

\* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I am sorry. I thought that he was a Communist as he was asking for passport to go to Russia. But that does not matter. If I am wrong in saying that he is a Communist, well, I withdraw my statement. He is not a Communist. He is an innocent man. (Renewed laughter.) Innocent man as he is, Mr. Gopalakrishniah thinks that hotels and other things can be started by anyone and that there will be no difficulty. He is not perhaps aware that there



[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [13th March 1953]

are a hundred ways by which municipalities and Governments can prevent such things happening. I wish to tell Mr. Gopalakrishniah that he must be prepared for all these things. Things will not be so easy as he imagines. The point is that a city will grow. Whether you want it or not, it will grow when the capital is established. I have seen New Delhi in the old days and now. Within a few years, I have seen the amount of congestion that has grown there. Buildings have grown and trade has grown there.

12-40 P.M. “It was a deserted looking place at first. One would have to carry friends along with one so that one may not feel lonely while going on the road. Now the place is congested. Why? Because the capital is located there. I have no doubt that the Andhra State will flourish and will be stronger on account of its difficulties. They start under difficulties, and so they will grow quicker and stronger and the capital will grow like magic. I have no doubt whatsoever that there will be a new spirit of unity among the Andhras even if they suffer difficulties in the beginning stages. If, on the other hand, I make it all easy for them, if I had only been a trickster as I am perhaps thought to be by some of them, if I invited them to be here in spite of the separation, there would be numerous divisions among the Andhra politicians. But if they go away—it does not matter if they go in anger—sit and work with unity as other people have worked, I do not think it will take long for them to be strong and happy. I feel pretty confident that very soon good feeling will prevail. For the time being, let us not take any wrong step or do the wrong thing. There is no doubt that in the distant future, if not in the immediate future, we will be friends and all that is happening now will read like a story. I do hope and pray that that time will come soon.

“I hope, Sir, that the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition will be withdrawn. There are very ungenerous things said in it against the Government—everything has gone wrong; nothing has been done and all that. I wish he had been sitting on this side and then he would have understood the meaning of what I say. It is very ungenerous. But I hope he will withdraw the amendment and allow the Motion to be passed without opposition.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“I shall now put the amendments<sup>a</sup> to the vote of the House.”

As the following Members were not in their places when their names were called, their amendments were deemed to be withdrawn:—

Sri K. P. Gopalan,  
Sri M. Veerabhadram,  
Sri G. Yellamanda Reddi,  
Sri E. T. Kunhan,  
Sri V. Gopala Gounder, and  
Sri T. Shanmugham.

<sup>a</sup> Vide pages 53-65 of Proceedings, dated 10th March 1953.

13th March 1953] [Mr. Speaker]

The amendments standing the name of the following Members were, by leave, withdrawn:—

Sri P. K. Gopalakrishnan,  
Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah,  
Sri K. R. Viswanathan,  
Sri K. Uppi.  
Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu,  
Sri K. T. Raju,  
Sri P. Rangasamy Reddiar, and  
Sri G. Latchanna.

The amendments standing in the name of the following Members were put to the House and lost:—

Sri M. Narayana Kurup,  
Sri N. Sivarami Reddi,  
Sri K. Subba Reddi,  
Sri D. Seetharamiah,  
Sri M. Narayanaswamy,  
Sri P. Rama Rao,  
Sri S. Kasi Reddi,  
Sri T. Nagi Reddi,  
Sri S. Vemiah,  
Sri M. Hanumantha Rao,  
Sri C. H. Kanaran,  
Sri P. Narasimha Reddi,  
Sri C. V. K. Rao,  
Sri S. Ramalingam,  
Sri K. Madhavan Nambiar,  
Sri K. Venkiah,  
Sri V. Sri Krishna,  
Sri M. Kune Rao,  
Sri A. Govindaswami Nayagar,  
Sri K. C. Gopalan Unni,  
Sri G. Rama Rao,  
Sri G. Anjaneyulu,  
Sri B. Lakshmi Narasa Raju,  
Sri K. R. Sambandam,  
Sri K. Krishna Rao, and  
Sri T. Potha Raju.

MR. SPEAKER:—"Now, I wish to know whether the Leader of the Opposition is withdrawing his amendment?" 12-50 p.m.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I am not withdrawing it, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Then I will put his amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

'Add the following at the end:—

"but regret that while during the last nine months life for all sections of the common people has worsened in every way, while famine is spreading to vast and newer areas and districts, while prices of foodgrains have been rising, while producers of



[Mr. Speaker]

[13th March 1953]

cotton, sugarcane, groundnut and other commercial crops, merchants and small industrialists are being ruined on account of the slump, while lakhs of handloom weavers' families have been uprooted on account of the collapse of the industry, while mass unemployment has been growing while industries are being worked partially on account of the increasing power cut leading to curtailment of production and partial unemployment and loss of wages to industrial workers, while development work in electricity has been stopped in a number of cases leading to the discharge of thousands of technical workers, while vast sections of people in Tanjore, Tiruchirappalli districts have been deprived of their means of livelihood on account of the cyclone havoc, the Government have not only totally failed to take steps to arrest the growing deterioration of the economic condition but are actually aggravating the problem by refusing to take adequate steps to prevent the breakdown of Krishna anicut and continuing the policy of suppression of popular democratic movements aiming to change the conditions by keeping in jail political prisoners whom it refuses to classify as political prisoners, by not withdrawing a number of political cases and by refusing to withdraw the restrictions on public meeting imposed in vast areas by the Police." " " "

The amendment was declared lost. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus—

*Ayes.*

Dr. K. B. Menon.  
Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai.  
„ M. Venkatasubba Reddi.  
„ S. Pakkiriswami Pillai.  
„ K. R. Nallasivam.  
„ K. Moidoo.  
„ K. Venkatakurmi Naidu.  
„ C. Velukkan.  
„ M. Bapiah Choudary.  
„ N. Sivarami Reddi.  
„ D. Soetharamiah.  
„ C. H. Kanaran.  
„ K. Madhavan Nambiar.  
„ M. Hanumantha Rao.  
„ C. V. K. Rao.  
„ K. Rajagopala Rao.  
„ K. Govinda Rao.  
„ P. Rama Rao.  
„ V. Rama Rao.  
„ T. Potha Raju.  
„ K. Malakondayya.  
„ M. Narayanaswamy.  
„ K. Venkaiah.  
„ P. Syamasundara Rao.  
„ B. Lakshminarasa Raju.  
„ G. Satyanarayana.  
„ G. Anjaneyulu.  
„ V. Sri Krishna.  
„ G. Joseph.  
„ M. Veerabhadran.  
„ M. Kune Rao.  
„ G. Nageshwara Rao.  
„ R. Venkata Jagga Rao.  
„ K. Ranga Rao.  
„ K. Subba Reddi.  
„ Chandra Ramalingayya.

Sri C. Prabhakara Choudary.  
„ G. Rama Rao.  
„ K. Vinayakam.  
„ S. Swayamprakasam.  
„ A. Senapathi Gounder.  
„ Mookiah Thevar.  
„ E. L. Raghava Mudaliar.  
„ K. Krishna Rao.  
„ P. Rangaswamy Reddiar.  
„ M. P. Subramaniam.  
„ Vavilala Gopalakrishniah.  
„ Lakshmi Narayana Reddi.  
„ P. Kandaswamy Gounder.  
„ G. C. Kondayya.  
Dr. G. Chitrabalam.  
Sri K. R. Sambandam.  
„ S. Kasi Reddy.  
„ Saka Venkata Rao.  
„ B. Sankariah.  
„ T. Nagi Reddi.  
„ Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu.  
„ Bojja Appalasamy.  
„ A. Rathinam.  
„ D. Dasarathan.  
„ S. Vemiah.  
„ R. Siddanna Gowd.  
„ R. Krishnan.  
„ N. V. L. Narasimha Rao.  
„ G. Bapanayya.  
„ S. S. Kolkeball.  
„ C. Subbarayudu.  
„ P. Kuchirama Kidav.  
„ B. Ramakrishna Reddy.  
„ K. Bapanna Dora.  
„ N. K. Palaniswamy.  
„ M. Lakshmanaswamy.

13th March 1958]

*Ayes—cont.*

Sri K. Gajapathi Reddi.  
 „ P. Ramamurthi.  
 „ M. Kalyanasundaram.  
 „ K. T. Raju.  
 „ T. C. Narayana Nambiyar.  
 „ K. P. Gopalan.  
 „ P. Jeevanandam.  
 „ C. Kandaswamy.  
 „ P. K. Gopalakrishnan.  
 „ A. Govindaswamy Nayagar.  
 „ K. C. Gopalan Unni.  
 „ V. Madanagopal.

Sri S. Ramalingam.  
 „ N. Sivaraj.  
 „ A. K. Subbiah.  
 „ K. V. Ramaswami.  
 „ T. S. Ardhaniari.  
 „ P. Venkatesha Sholagar.  
 „ P. Narasimha Reddi.  
 „ V. Sankaranarayana Menon.  
 „ K. T. Sridharan.  
 „ M. Narayana Kurup.  
 „ M. Narayana Nambiar.  
 „ O. Koran.

*Noes.*

The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.  
 „ A. B. Shetty.  
 „ M. A. Manickavelu  
 Naicker.

The Hon. Dr. U. Krishna Rao.  
 Sri K. Rajaram.  
 „ B. Baktavatsalu Naidu.  
 „ C. Rajam Ramaswami.  
 „ P. G. Karuthruman.  
 „ B. K. Nallasamy.  
 „ S. C. Virupakshiah.  
 „ P. S. Nalla Gounder.  
 „ P. G. Manickam.  
 „ R. Kuppuswami.  
 „ V. K. Palaniswami Gounder.  
 „ N. Mounagurusami Naidu.  
 „ P. S. Rangaswamy Naidu.  
 „ S. R. Arumugam.  
 „ K. H. Bomman.  
 „ M. K. Kempai Gounder.  
 „ M. P. Periaswami.  
 „ Ardhanareswara Gounder.  
 „ A. Sambasivam.  
 „ Lakshmana Kandar.

Dr. P. Varadarajulu Naidu.  
 The Hon. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan  
 Nayar.

„ Dr. R. Nagan Gouda.  
 Sri N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.  
 „ T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi.  
 „ K. Koti Reddi.  
 „ A. M. Sambandam.  
 „ M. R. Ramachandran.  
 „ O. Venkatasubba Reddi.  
 „ B. Parameswaran.  
 „ V. K. Ramasamy Mudaliar.  
 „ T. P. Elumalai.  
 „ S. Panchaksharam.  
 „ A. K. Masilamani Chettiar.  
 „ H. M. Jagannatham.  
 „ A. Ramachandra Reddiar.  
 „ R. Thangavelu.  
 „ R. A. Nataraja Mudaliar.  
 „ M. Kandasamy Padayachi.  
 „ L. Anandan.  
 „ V. Krishnaswami Padayachi.  
 „ G. Vagheesam Pillay.  
 „ A. S. Sahajanandam.  
 „ O. A. Nanjappa.  
 „ P. M. Munuswamy Gounder.  
 „ S. Arumugam.  
 „ M. Marimuthu.  
 „ Mohamed Salih Maraikayar.  
 „ G. Narayanaswamy Naidu.

Sri M. C. Muthukumarasamy.  
 The Hon. Sri V. C. Palaniswami Goun-  
 der.

„ K. Venkataswamy Naidu.  
 „ N. Sankara Reddi.  
 „ D. Saajeveiah.  
 „ Shanmuga Rajeswara  
 Seethapathi (the Raja of  
 Ramnad).  
 „ S. B. P. Pattabhirama Rao.  
 Srimathi Dr. T. S. Soundaram Rama-  
 chandran.

„ T. Kotamma Reddi.  
 Sri M. S. Muniswamy Pillay.  
 „ S. Chinna Karuppa Thevar.  
 „ V. S. Sivaprakasam.  
 „ A. Ayyanar.  
 „ V. Muthu.  
 „ A. S. Subbaraj.  
 „ S. Thinakarasaami Thevar.  
 „ K. Krishnasami Naidu.  
 „ S. Jayaram Reddiar.  
 „ R. V. Swaminathan.  
 „ Vaikuntam.  
 „ G. Govindan.  
 „ P. S. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar.  
 „ S. Ramasamy Naidu.  
 „ Ar. A. Km. Chokkalingam Chettiar.  
 „ P. Chellathurai.  
 „ N. Rajagopal.  
 „ R. M. Palaniappan.  
 „ A. Ramasamy Thevar.  
 „ T. K. Rama.  
 „ T. V. Sannasi.  
 „ Antony Peter.  
 „ T. R. Varadan.  
 „ C. Muthiah Pillay.  
 „ Thiagaraja Pillay.  
 „ S. Venkatarama Ayyar.  
 „ V. S. Chinnaswa ni Naidu.  
 „ P. Urkavalan.  
 „ A. Ramasundara Karunalaya  
 Pandian.  
 „ M. G. Shanker.  
 „ P. Selvaraj.  
 „ V. Arumugham.  
 „ K. Ramasamy Doss.  
 „ R. S. Arumugham.  
 „ A. Venkatramiah.  
 „ A. Rami Reddi.  
 „ N. Chenchurama Naidu.  
 „ P. Gopalakrishna Reddi.  
 „ K. Shanmugham.  
 „ P. Venkataswami Reddi.

1-10  
p.m.



[13th March 1953]

*Noes—cont.*

Sri S. R. V. P. Murthy Raju.  
 „ Thota Ramasamy.  
 „ P. Satyanarayana Reddi.  
 „ R. B. V. Sudarsanavarma.  
 „ Chi. Indrayya.  
 „ Raja M. A. Muthiah Chettiar.  
 „ L. Lakshmana Das.  
 „ H. Satyanarayana Dora.  
 „ P. Venkatasubbayya.  
 „ G. Sivasankara Reddi.  
 „ S. Narayanappa.  
 „ P. Ranga Reddi.  
 „ N. Gepala Menon.  
 „ A. Appu.  
 „ B. Krishnamoorthy Row.  
 „ K. Varadaachari.  
 „ A. Balarama Reddi.  
 „ D. Ramabrahmam.  
 „ K. Adikesavalu Naidu.  
 „ M. Doraikannu.  
 „ H. Ramalinga Reddi.  
 „ G. Nagabhushanam.  
 „ S. Parameswarappa.  
 „ T. Mallayya.  
 „ T. Anantha Pai.  
 „ Y. Manjaya Shetty.  
 „ K. Venkatramana Gowda.  
 „ N. N. Suvama.  
 „ E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.  
 „ M. S. Mogral.  
 „ V. Chinnayya.  
 „ P. Thimma Reddi.  
 „ G. Latchanna.

Sri M. Muni Reddi.  
 „ Asi Nelladri Rao Reddi.  
 „ P. Gangayya.  
 „ N. C. Ramasami Kandar.  
 „ Somasundara Gounder.  
 „ M. Subramania Nayakar.  
 „ K. V. Ramesam.  
 „ M. Srungaram.  
 „ K. Venkatanarayana Dora.  
 „ N. Venkatayya.  
 „ M. Gangappa.  
 „ L. C. Pais.  
 „ V. Dharmalinga Nayakar.  
 „ K. Uppi.  
 „ M. Chadayan.  
 „ O. Ahmed Kutty.  
 „ Kunhi Mohamed Shaffee.  
 „ K. M. Seethi.  
 „ G. Samia Koorayar.  
 „ V. K. Kannan.  
 „ K. Venkata Setty.  
 „ M. Subba Reddi.  
 „ R. Lakshminarasimha Dora.  
 „ R. Rangaswamy Gounder.  
 „ V. Balakrishnan.  
 „ K. S. Lakshminpathy Naicker.  
 „ Sagi Satyanarayana Raju.  
 „ V. R. Nagarajan.  
 „ K. R. Viswanatham.  
 „ M. Kattimuthu.  
 „ S. Radhakrishnan.  
 „ A. Muthusamy.

*Neutral.*

Sri O. Chengam Pillai.

Ayes 96, Noes 166.

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ Now I will put the main motion to the vote of the House. The question is—

‘ That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor as follows:—

“ Sir, We, the Members of the Madras Legislative Assembly beg to thank Your Excellency for the Address delivered to both the Houses of the Legislature on the 7th March 1953.” ”

The motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The House will now adjourn and meet again at 4-30 p.m. on 14th March 1953.”

The House then adjourned.

## IV.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

*The Report of the Select Committee on the Madras Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 11 of 1952) and the proceedings.*